

6th December 1952]

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS MOTOR VEHICLES (TAXATION OF PASSENGERS AND GOODS) BILL, 1952—*cont.*

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The House will now continue the discussion on the motion that the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill be taken into consideration at once and the amendments to that motion.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to point out in the first instance why this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. It was stated by the Hon. Chief Minister and also the Minister for Transport that this Bill has already been discussed by the Select Committee. I want to clear that misapprehension so that we need not proceed on that basis at all. The Bill that was referred to the Select Committee was not this Bill. So, whatever was discussed by the Select Committee was on an entirely different basis. For, the original provision was for taxing the passengers. Evidence was also taken and concentrated on that particular aspect only, namely, whether it was the appropriate time, whether it was possible, whether it was feasible and whether it was workable to impose a tax on passengers at the rate of one pie per mile and on the other ancillary provisions. I would, however, concede this much that by the time that Bill returned to the House from the Select Committee, it appeared only on the outer trapping to be the same as the present one. But I may tell that in substance, there is vast difference between these two Bills. The memoranda that were received for the other Bill are different, the evidence that was taken was different. Therefore, I submit that the argument that this Bill has already been discussed by the Select Committee is not a valid ground at all. (Interruption.) The Hon. Chief Minister says, ‘ Don’t rely on technicalities. In substance it is the same Bill ’. Let me tell him that in substance it is not. With regard to the other Bill, we collected memoranda and took evidence on one basis. But now they have changed the main provisions and have brought it, even before the Select Committee, but it was ruled out. What I want is this. Let us get further memoranda upon this Bill, which is different from the previous one in that it is a tax on the operators and lorry-owners. Therefore let us invite further evidence and get further facts and then let us proceed. The Government refuse to do this. The evidence that was collected was entirely directed and tendered from a different point of view altogether. Therefore, I submit in substance also this is not a Bill that was considered by the Select Committee. Suppose this Bill was the one that was referred to the Select Committee. Then the memoranda and evidence taken by the Select Committee would have been of a different nature.

“ Then, Sir, the second point is, as has already been stated by several Members here, at present the bus operators are not in a position to pay this extra charge. This is a fact which has been partly conceded by the Hon. the Minister for Transport himself.

3-10
p.m.

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [6th December 1952]

I would only submit that the Government of Madras in a publication of theirs have given the working cost of buses which they admit is high. If we look into this pamphlet which the Government have issued, we will find that the costs are distributed under several heads, under prime cost and overhead cost. The prime cost consists of wages, fuel, oil, upkeep and maintenance and the overhead cost shows that of establishment and 'miscellaneous' including telephone, electricity, water, licence fees, depreciation, etc. This pamphlet shows that the running cost of a bus in the City of Madras managed by the Government is 13 annas 4.5 pies. This is a thing which the Hon. the Minister for Industries knows and every Member on the other side knows. Similarly we had asked the bus operators to prepare a costing statement for us and they did prepare one and gave us. For the information of the House—I know the Hon. the Minister for Transport knows and the Hon. the Minister for Finance is in the full know of facts—I shall quote from it what the running cost of a bus privately managed comes to in this State, and try to compare it with the running cost of a Government Transport bus. In the Visakhapatnam district, the costs have been calculated on the same lines as in this pamphlet. There the cost comes to 14 annas per mile whereas 12 annas 9 pies is the gross income per mile. The operators are working at a loss and this is proved by the fact that banks and Marwaris are lending them money month after month. The operators are not in a position to get out and sell away their buses. So they are carrying on with what little margin they might have secured in the previous years of boom. Then, Sir, in the East and West Godavari and Krishna districts, I have the figures with me, the calculation of running cost is made on the same basis, under the two headings mentioned in the Government publication. The total expenditure per mile comes to 13 annas 2 pies and the gross income is 12 annas 10 pies. There is no use of saying that these operators always give wrong figures and double sets of figures and mistaken figures. The figures they have given more or less tally with the figures given in the Government pamphlet in respect of their own service in the City. Therefore, we must take it that the figures are fairly accurate. In Visakhapatnam, the operators work at a loss. In East and West Godavari and Krishna districts, the loss incurred by the operators is four pies per mile. In Chingleput district, the income is 10 annas 5 pies and they are working at a loss of one pie in the mile. They get a gross income of 10 annas 5 pies and they have to spend 10 annas 6 pies. Let me now take the figures given by another transport service. This service has got a fleet of 34 buses. The running cost per mile per bus given by this service is 12 annas 8.5 pies. The gross collections come to 13 annas 6 pies exclusive of income-tax in 1951; in 1952 the income was 12 annas 10 pies as against an expenditure of 12 annas 2 pies exclusive of income-taxes. It is not as if this very narrow margin is occurring in the case of only small bus owners. The running cost incurred by a transport company which runs a very efficient service with 34 buses comes to 12 annas 8 pies. This is from Guntur. So taking

6th December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

together the running costs in Visakhapatnam, East and West Godavari, Krishna and Chingleput districts, they tally approximately with the Government's cost mentioned in the pamphlet. Then take Rayalaseema. There the running cost comes to 12 to 13 annas per mile and the average income per mile is 12 to 14 annas. This was formerly the case. But now it is only eight annas. These are facts which cannot be denied. The Government recognize that there is a slump. There is a slump in trade. The decontrol of food has contributed something towards a slump in the operation of lorry services. So, Sir, when we object to this taxation, it is not upon political grounds. Let the Hon. the Chief Minister be clear in his mind and let hon. Members on the other side of the House be clear in their minds that when we object to taxation measures it is not on political grounds. It is the ground of the incapacity and inability of the man who is asked to pay the tax. Is it or is it not a fact that these operators are paying more than 45 per cent of their income—of their gross collections—by way of taxes? The Government pose the question 'You do not want big operators to be taxed; do you want to leave off big capitalists?' Sir, this is a poser and a political method of putting the question. The question is whether we want to exempt those who are paying nothing to the State or those who are already paying by way of taxes more than 45 per cent of their income. The question was put during the last Select Committee to one of the biggest fleet owners of this State whether the incidence of tax, if shifted from the passengers to the bus operators, would be such as would enable the operators to pay the tax. That biggest operator, I know from all accounts, is one of the most trustworthy persons in this State. He said: 'My company might be able to pay and not others'. I suppose his words are still remembered by the Hon. the Minister for Transport and the Hon. the Minister for Finance. (The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam: It was I that put the question.) The Hon. the Minister for Finance claims credit for putting the question. Whether he put it or I put it, he gave the answer when we said that the passengers should not be asked to pay the tax and it should be examined whether the bus operators could pay it. Apart from the general answer that he gave, I have now read out figures of income of the operators. These cannot be said to be mistaken figures or wrong figures.

" Then, Sir, besides all these, I want to bring to the notice of the Hon. the Chief Minister one other fact. It is not as if he does not know it. He knows it and I want to refresh his mind now. Apart from the legitimate expenses that an operator has to incur, which come to 13 to 14 annas per mile in the various areas of the State, they have other items of expenditure which are not legitimate. It is more necessary for them to meet this expenditure than even that on petrol and other things. And this is the Police mamools. I am told at every ration chowki, they have to pay the Police eight rupees for every lorry entering into the City. At the place where the ration chowki is located,

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [6th December 1952]

collections are going on. The helpless operators in order to prevent harassment are obliged to pay the mamools. In spite of the Government running its machinery efficiently, this happens, because the machinery itself is collecting it. It is not preventing it. It is part of it. This is an unfortunate feature. I would ask the Hon. the Chief Minister respectfully to believe what I say now. Near the Red Hills, there is located a toll gate and bus operators are obliged to pay five rupees per bus to the Police as mamool. (The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam: 'Do you know it personally?') Questions like 'are you present when a bus comes and the thing happens?' cannot help. Ask anyone. Ask the most trustworthy bus operator as I asked. Ask some owners of buses on your side, not this side, on the floor of the House. They will tell you how they are obliged to pay these mamools. These are all illegal exactions. I am only incidentally pointing out all these facts with regard to the argument that is often put forward that these bus operators might give wrong accounts and those accounts ought not to be relied upon."

3-20
P.M.

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Incidentally it shows that they can pay this tax also."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"This cannot be taken to indicate the capacity to pay the proposed tax. The payments I referred to are compulsory exactions. If he does not pay those exactions, he will have to close his industry and the whole capital will become a waste."

"That is another matter altogether. But with regard to the expenses and income of the bus operators, I have read out figures and also compared them with the figures furnished by the Government themselves. It cannot be argued with any degree of justification that they are fudged figures. Though I cannot vouch that they are cent per cent correct, I can say they are fairly correct for they tally with the figures furnished by the Government themselves. I have furnished figures in respect of Visakhapatnam, Chingleput, East and West Godavari, Krishna and Guntur districts. Some memoranda have been presented after the publication of this Bill, that is, after the Select Committee went into the previous Bill. This question of taxing the operators was not before the Select Committee. The operators in the districts of Coimbatore, Kurnool and Ramanathapuram also have now submitted their memoranda. In fact there is not a single district from which this sort of memorandum has not come and there is no disagreement among these operators. I may also inform the House that a good number of these operators are always at the mercy of some big creditors because there is not a single operator who is able to conduct his operations without taking a large advance from these banks. Some of them, particularly after March this year, had to surrender their permits or the buses are now lying idle because they are not able to run them at a profit. They are not able to collect enough money to meet the daily expenses."

6th December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

“ Sir, I submit that if the figures furnished by the operators are disputed, these are all facts which go to show this is a fit case for enquiry. These figures which were already submitted by the operators must be relied upon because they tally with the figures furnished by the Government in respect of the Transport Department. Even if the Hon. the Finance Minister and the Transport Minister have a little suspicion about it, I say it is a matter for enquiry. Now who will enquire into all this? The Bill has been taken up here. In the interest of justice I say, that we should be satisfied that we are passing a correct legislation. When we are asked to give our consent to this legislation which is touching the pockets of persons who are crying that they are not able to pay anything more, for already they are paying by way of taxes, more than 45 per cent of their collections, with their expenditure side showing an increase of 400 per cent while the income has increased only by 75 per cent, I am asking, Mr. Speaker, whether it is not a fit case for enquiry into all these facts. I am not saying that their figures should be accepted as absolutely correct. I do not also say or agree with the Government in their contention that the figures furnished by the operators were all made up figures, that they were all wrong, that they have double set of accounts and all that. There is no use saying that their cry that they are running their business at a loss is not correct. I have said that the deficit shown by the Government in the Budget is itself not a real deficit. If a proper committee of scrutiny is set up I would rearrange the entire budget and I am here to help the Government to show that they can have no deficit, that they can collect more taxes under certain heads, that they can cut down expenditure in several other items and that really there is no deficit. Therefore I submit this is a matter for enquiry. We must have a committee as it were to go into all these aspects. I do not say that it should be remitted to a fact finding committee. I am only saying that in view of the fact that according to the figures furnished by the operators they are incapable of paying any further taxes, there is a *prima facie* case, there is a reasonable case for us to go into the facts. Let the Select Committee collect the facts and if the Government and the Members of the Select Committee are satisfied that they are capable of paying more taxes, by all means I will give my full, even 110 per cent consent to the passing of this measure. With the information available with me, I feel they are not capable of paying more taxes. I am not pleading for the capitalists and the rich men. There may be one or two rich men running these services but most of them cannot bear the taxes. And therefore it is that I am making this reasonable proposition that it should be referred to the Select Committee. In the matter of lorries, they are a new feature in the Bill. Whatever information we gathered in the last Select Committee was with reference to the bus services. Therefore these are matters which should be gone into. Let the Select Committee have the facts before them and by all means if the Government are satisfied that they are capable of bearing more taxes, most certainly we will

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [6th December 1952]

be willing to pass this Bill. But now there is a case for referring this Bill to a Select Committee and hence my amendment."

* JANAB K. M. SEETHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I apologise to you for my not having been in my seat when I was called by you and I thank you now for your kindness in having given me this opportunity to speak on this important Bill and the amendments that have been moved on the floor of this House.

" The amendment of the hon. Member Mr. Viswanatham that this Bill might be referred to a Select Committee does not appeal to me for this simple reason that all the aspects connected with this Bill were the subject matter of representations made to the Select Committee which sat on the Bill, although technically the Bill that was referred to the Select Committee is not the identical Bill that is now under discussion. All the important points involved in this Bill were the subject of consideration by the other Select Committee and they were matters of representation before the Select Committee by the interests concerned. The bus operators and their representatives had their full say then. There is no new fact to be learned by the Bill being referred again to the Select Committee. Therefore I respectfully submit that no useful purpose will be served by referring this Bill again to a Select Committee. So I am obliged to oppose this amendment for reference to a Select Committee.

" As regards the main Bill, I might say that taxation is always unpopular. Whichever section the Government might tax, opposition will come, objections will be raised and there would be all round protests against such taxation. Has there been one occasion when Government launched upon taxation and the interests concerned did not protest against such taxation? When the super-tax was imposed, when the income tax was imposed, when the sales tax was imposed, the interests concerned always protested and pleaded their inability to pay. So one need not be surprised to hear now about the abject poverty of the bus operators when this new taxation measure is launched by the Government. Sir, I do not say that the bus operators are earning fabulous incomes now from their industry. As a matter of fact various factors, the cost of spare parts and petrol, the increased wages paid to labourers, and the difficulties created for the operators by their present friends—the Communists—all these have certainly brought about a very substantial decrease in the income which they were getting. So, there is a little bit of heart-burning on the part of bus operators in regard to this new burden that is sought to be imposed upon them. But I honestly believe that this is a burden which they can fairly bear in the interests of a Welfare State which it is our attempt to build up. When sales tax is collected, even the poorest man is making his contribution to the exchequer and there is no reason why the bus operators, most of whom are at least making both ends meet and are carrying on their industry, should not be called upon to bear the burden of taxation to some extent, especially when the State is faced with an emergency of

6th December 1952] [Janab K. M. Seethi]

finding funds for meeting a very big deficit. As a matter of fact, in normal times fresh taxation will be absolutely unjustifiable for building up a surplus budget and certainly every section of the House has got every reason to protest against it. But when the State is faced with a huge deficit and when a financial collapse is feared, there is every justification for standing by and supporting the Government in tapping fresh sources of income and the present measure of taxation is one which will cause comparatively little heart-burning to the section affected thereby. It was suggested on the floor of the House by some hon. Members that even the travelling public will be hard hit by this taxation measure. As far as my district is concerned, to the best of my information, the maximum fare of seven pies per mile is being charged by the bus operators even now. So when this fresh taxation is levied, there is no risk that they will increase the fare and add to the burden of the travelling public. So that aspect of the matter need not worry us. It is only the income of the bus operator that is the real issue that has to be taken into consideration. Whether the income of the operator will justify fresh taxation is the point for consideration. It may be that there will be difficulty in some cases. But I feel the bus operators will be in a position to bear this burden in the interests of the State. Sir, it will be the duty of the Government no doubt to see that the additional income that they may get by this new taxation should be used for providing better amenities to the travelling public. Some hon. Members have referred to that aspect of the matter. When taxation is imposed on a certain sector of the people, that the benefit of that taxation should also go to that sector is a very sound proposition, even though it may not be practicable to allocate the incomes to the different sectors quite exactly.

“ Then, Sir, the Opposition from the Communist Members to the bus operators being taxed is not a matter for surprise. When our venerable leader Rajaji asked my hon. Friend Mr. Ramamurthi that the Communists should throw off their masks and should come out into the open in their true colours, with great respect to Rajaji, I thought he was asking Mr. Ramamurthi to commit political suicide and was asking him to perform an impossibility. When a Communist cannot have a mask of his own and go about doing things in a straight and open way, then he ceases to be a Communist. So when Rajaji asked him to throw off the mask, he was asking for something quite non-communistic. The Communists in every country have been going about with masks.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI.—“ On a point of order, గౌరవ సభ్యుడు ఏదో mask ల గురించి ప్రసంగిస్తున్నారు. కమ్యూనిస్టులు masks పెట్టుకొని ప్రవర్తిస్తున్నారని ఆరోపణ చేస్తున్నారు. వీరు ఉదహరించే mask లకు యీ బిల్లుకు సంబంధ మేమో తెలియడంలేదు. వారివిధంగా ప్రసంగిస్తే, మేము కూడా ముస్లింలీగు వారి mask లను గురించి ప్రసంగించవలసివుంటుంది. నేటి సాక్షాత్తుకారి ప్రసంగం ఈ బిల్లుకు సంబంధించేనా అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

[6th December 1952]

* JANAB K. M. SEETHI :—“ Sir, my hon. Friend Mr. Nagi Reddi is shocked to hear my reference to communism. But he was for some time speaking for communism yesterday in a language which we were not able to comprehend, but the warmth of which we could appreciate.

“ So, I submit that this tax is really one which has been necessitated by the financial stringency of the Government and so, this measure deserves the support of this House. As has been suggested by some of our friends, the moment it is found to be unnecessary the Government will certainly see that it is taken off the Statute Book and the interests concerned are relieved of it.

“ Sir, I want to say a few words regarding a section of the Opposition Members. I am not attributing motives to them. To the Communists all is grist that comes to the mill. Whatever is done by the Government is made a propaganda weapon by the Communist Members of this House. I am prepared to take their challenge when my Communist Friend from Malabar said that the Muslim League Members and others who voted for the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Bill would have to face the agriculturists of Malabar. I know the agriculturists of Malabar and who their friends are and who their enemies are. We take their challenge. We took their challenge during the last elections and defeated the Communist candidates and made them forfeit their deposits.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, at first I did not think of taking much of the time of the House. But after the intervention of the Hon. the Chief Minister, I believe I have got to clarify the position. The Hon. the Chief Minister characterized the Opposition as hotch-potch Opposition. Allow me to say, Sir, that I have never heard such a hotch-potch speech on the floor of the House. When the Hon. the Chief Minister was called upon to defend a taxation measure, instead of answering the points raised against that measure, instead of answering to the facts and figures given against that measure, he came forward to talk on all subjects on earth, from the Peace Movement to the Students' Federation and what not. There is, however one running thread throughout this hotch-potch speech and that running thread is dubbing the opposition as communistic. The common opposition that comes to the measures of the Government from all parties on this side is communistic opposition. It may be that opposition might come from the Tamil Nad Toilers Party or from the Independents or from anybody else. But if there is any opposition to any measure of the Government, then it is communistic opposition. This way the specific tactics that had been used, but the Hon. the Chief Minister was talking of the tactics of the Communist Party. Now let me tell the House what the tactics of the Chief Minister here have been. His tactics not only in this State but throughout India, is to dub all popular opposition to the Government's unpopular measures as communistic opposition, and this tactics has got nothing original about it. As early

6th December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

as 1840, Karl Marx, the founder of the Communist movement, stated in the celebrated Communist Manifesto :

‘Where is the party in opposition that has not been decried as communistic by its opponents in power? Where is the opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of communism, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries.’

During the last 104 years, several reactionary parties in the world tried to stop the progress of society by branding those forces that stood for progress as communistic. But nonetheless, during these 104 years the all conquering doctrines of communism had been successfully defeating the forces of reaction throughout the world and communism has been triumphantly marching forward. Sir, very great insinuations were made. The Chief Minister said, ‘let the communists throw off their mask’. Sir, we are here to tear the mask off the face of the Chief Minister and of the party which he represents. That is the specific purpose for which we have come here. That is the specific task which we have got to perform here. As early as 1848 Marx proclaimed in the Communist Manifesto, the Communists disdain to conceal their aims. We do not conceal our aims at all. We proclaim to the world what we stand for and the methods and tactics we adopt. Concealment comes only from the party in power. It is the party in power that has been bamboozling the people by making all sorts of promises to the people in their election manifestoes and then going back upon them; and we are here to tear the mask off their face.

3-40
p.m.

“Now, Sir, the question is: why is the Communist party opposing this Bill? There are vested interests, I agree. The Hon. Chief Minister says ‘I would have welcomed and understood the position if the Communists who stand against vested interests give their support to the Bill; but here they are opposing it, and why? The only answer is that somehow or other this Government must be got rid of.’ That is what we are told by the Chief Minister. But again, I would say, we are not concealing our aims. The Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari claims to have read and claims to know our philosophy. He claims to have thoroughly read our books. But I would like to point out to him that if he had made any study of it, he would have understood why it is we are to-day not standing for the expropriation of capital in India. The Communist party in India, as everywhere else, bases itself on certain objective conditions. When Marx laid the law of revolution of society long long ago, talking of the law of revolution, this is what he pointed out:

‘Therefore, mankind always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve; since looking at the matter more closely, it will always be found that the task itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation’

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI :—“Sir, are we having a lecture on Communism here and not a speech on the Bill before the House?”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“I am only explaining the position of the Communists since the Hon. the Chief Minister wanted to know wherefrom the Communist party’s opposition arises to this

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [6th December 1952]

Bill. We have realized, the Communists have always realized, that there is no use setting an objective which cannot be immediately realized. Certainly we have got the objective of taking mankind and Indian society also through to socialism and then on to communism. We also realize that there are material conditions in this country, for which we are not responsible, material conditions for the existence of which only the Chief Minister and his party to-day are primarily responsible. We know that given these material conditions, we cannot to-day aim at building a socialist society. This we have never concealed. If the Hon. Chief Minister had only read our party's programme, the programme of the Communist party, he would have understood this. In the present stage of our development, the Communist party is not demanding the establishment of socialism in our country. We never said that we are not demanding it at any time; we simply say that to-day we do not demand the establishment of socialism in our country. Why? In view of the backwardness of the country and the weakness of the mass organizations of workers, peasants and of the toiling intelligentsia, our party does not find it possible at present to bring about a socialist transformation in our country. We do not believe and we do not think it is possible because certain material conditions of development are necessary for socialist transformation. Technical development is necessary. In a backward agrarian country in which feudal relations still dominate, and because of those feudal relations, industrial development is thwarted and cannot go forward, in such a state of things, how can we talk of the establishment of socialism immediately? We, therefore, say that to-day it is not possible to have socialism. That is why we are for a democratic revolution; that is why we say, establish a democratic order—not democracy on paper, not just the right to vote, but those material conditions which alone will ensure real democracy for the common people of this country. To-day, Sir, those conditions do not exist, and that is the specific reason why we say that to-day we are not for establishing socialism. If this simple thing is understood, then the Chief Minister would not have taken the line which he did take yesterday. Certainly, whoever asked for nationalization? Did the Communist party ask for the nationalization of all Indian industries to-day? No; we did not ask for it; we ask for the confiscation of British industries, so that they could be operated by our own capital and by our own Indian State. That is exactly the position.

“ Then, Sir, having said all these things, let me say this: when the Hon. Chief Minister made such insinuations, I would not have taken them very seriously, because I know the Chief Minister himself does not believe in what he says. Knowing him as I do, I know that he does not believe what he says. Unfortunately, however, it is likely that there are people in this country, millions of people in our State, who will take his words at their face value. Sir, I knew Mr. C. Rajagopalachari of the years 1942–1946: he was not at that time talking against communism. On the other hand I remember a wonderful speech he made,

6th December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

addressing the Students' Federation—the very federation which he referred to yesterday—in the Memorial Hall in the year 1943, wherein he told the students—I will just repeat it; I remember it because it has sunk deep into my memory—‘ If somebody tells you, you are an admirer of Russia, do not say ‘ no, no ’ but say ‘ yes, yes ’. Then he said ‘ A country which has stood the terrible test of the greatest of wars—there is something good in that country; there is something good in the leaders of that country; they may not believe in a God but they are a godly people ’. Sir, these were the words which Mr. Rajagopalachari used in 1943.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I say so again.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ But to-day the Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari—in the year 1943 he was not honourable, he was only a Mr.—says that he is again prepared to repeat the same thing. And yet, he will not allow our people to go freely to that country of godly people and godly leaders but does everything in his power to prevent people from getting into contact with that country and its people, from getting passports to go to that country. He does not want our people to be contaminated with that godliness. It is Russia and China the countries with godly peoples that are his greatest difficulty to-day.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The other way about. I don't want those godly people to be contaminated. I may assure him that those godly people will take care of themselves. The Soviet people and the Chinese people to-day do not need the care and help of the Hon. the Chief Minister of the State of Madras. (Laughter.) They will take care of themselves.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ That was the Mr. Rajagopalachari of that time. There was no anti-communism at that time. Again, I would like to remind him of a conversation he had with me at that time. There was a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee at Bombay in October 1945 and at that time he had not yet been rehabilitated into the Congress. We were both going out to a friend's place for dining. I was facing at that time some disciplinary action from the Congress. He then told me, in the car,—I would just like to remind him of this—‘ why do you try to cling to this Congress? Why bother about explanations and disciplinary actions and all that? The time has come for you to place a separate and independent economic programme before the people and fight the policy of the Congress.’ Sir, I took that advice, the advice of Mr. C. Rajagopalachari of 1945; I took it very seriously and we placed a programme before the people in the year 1945 and again in the year 1951 we placed it before them and fought the Congress. And, if we fight the Congress to-day, we are told that we fight for the sake of opposition and that somehow or other we want the Congress to get out. And this is the logic that is being adopted. Why? Because that was Mr. Rajagopalachari, who had not yet been rehabilitated, giving the advice and to-day

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [6th December 1952]

3-50
p.m.

it is the Hon. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, Chief Minister in a Congress Cabinet, that now speaks on the floor of this House. That is why I say that I do not believe that he himself believes in what he has stated yesterday. Anyway, Sir, having stated this, he went on to talk about so many other things. Next he talked about the peace movement being a war movement. It does not require any proof to say that it is a war movement. If the Hon. Chief Minister, Rajagopalachari, thinks and he declares from the platform of this Legislative Assembly that the peace movement is a war movement, then it is gospel truth, it is the truth of Lord Krishna in the Bhagavat Gita and must be accepted. Why, Sir, if any proof is needed, I would like to ask whether the movement that demanded unconditional destruction of all atomic weapons, the banning of the use of all atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and which demanded that the Government which uses such weapons must be proclaimed an enemy of mankind—is that a war movement? What is it that is a war movement, I would like to ask? Is that movement that demands the immediate cessation of the wars raging in Asian countries a war movement? The peace movements are to-day demanding that the Chinese Republic should be recognized in order that there may be peace in the world. Is it a war movement? I would like to ask the Chief Minister, what is that movement which demanded for the last two years that the five greatest powers of the world must meet together in order to see that peace is established. That is the very slogan which the All-India Congress Committee recently accepted at the meeting at Indore. If the peace movement raised the slogan 1½ years ago it became a war movement and if the All-India Congress Committee accepts it after 1½ years of mobilization of peoples all over the world, then it becomes a peace movement. That is truth and that is respect for truth shown by the Chief Minister.

“Then, Sir, the Chief Minister referred to the students’ organization and all sorts of things. We have never concealed the fact that we are Communists. At no time did we conceal that fact. We have openly proclaimed that we are Communists, we proclaim ourselves to be Communists, and our people go to the various organizations because they want to work for their own benefit. We work in the Trade Union movement and Congressmen also work in the Trade Union movement and the All-India National Trade Union Congress has been established by them. It is claimed that it is free from politics. But yet the I.N.T.U.C. would ask the workers to vote for the Congress. This is not politics! We have never asked inside the Trade Union Congress that its members should vote for the Communist party or this party or that party, but if the workers like us they vote for us. Where have we done propaganda for communism in any of these organizations?

“Now, Sir, having said all these things, I now come to the crux of the question that is before us. The Hon. Chief Minister argued that as far as this Bill is concerned, the reason why it should

6th December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

be supported is that the Communists are opposing it. Here are certain vested interests being taxed and why should the Communists stand against these vested interests being taxed, the Hon. Chief Minister said yesterday. He said these bus operators have made, and are making terrible profits and so, why not these people pay over some profits to the Government. I would like to ask the Hon. Chief Minister, who is a great respecter of truth as to whether he listened to the speech of the Hon. Minister for Industries? Did he verify whether the generalization that he made yesterday that the bus operators are making profits corresponds to truth? In fact, I must say that the speech of the Hon. Minister who moved this Bill is the best speech on behalf of the Opposition. He did not say anything in support of the Bill. He said in categorical terms that many of the bus operators to-day are not making both ends meet and it may be that many of the operators are even running into a loss, but nonetheless because the State has got to get money somehow or other, he appealed to those interests to somehow or other come and pay the tax. This is the specific appeal that was made by the mover of the Bill. Now, I would like to ask, which is the real truth? Whether the Hon. Dr. Krishna Rao told the truth or the Hon. Chief Minister told the truth, I ask? Both cannot obviously be the truth. Two diametrically opposite statements cannot be both true. But, what I think is the truth is what the Hon. Dr. Krishna Rao has said.

“ Now, Sir, these are the figures given by the State Government of Madras. Now, in the City of Madras more than 300 buses are operating and the total cost per mile in 1951—we are now in 1952 and the costs have gone up, let us not forget that—works out to 13 annas 4.5 pies and the gross collections amounted to 14 annas 10.6 pies per mile. These figures, I think, are given without taking into account taxation. (The Hon. Dr. U. Krishna Rao: ‘ That is also added.’) They are added. I stand subject to correction. Then, Sir, these are the figures that are given by the State Government and they advertise here that the cost of operation of the buses per mile is lower than that of any other big City Motor Transport system in this country or elsewhere. That is the specific advertisement, or a certificate which they have given to themselves. Under these conditions, the cheapest motor operating industry in the City of Madras, means 13 annas 4.5 pies per mile. Now, the margin that is left according to these figures comes to about $1\frac{1}{2}$ annas per mile. Obviously as far as the buses in the State which are to be taxed are concerned, they are not operating under the favourable conditions under which the Madras City Bus Transport is operating. Here the rates are by far better because they work under the best of conditions because of the good roads and therefore the wear and tear is less. That is one aspect of the question that has to be taken into consideration. Apart from that, it is a big bus service with 300 or 400 buses and therefore their maintenance charges are less. And, in spite of all these things, the margin is only $1\frac{1}{2}$ annas per mile. In the case of the other bus operators what will be the margin? Hardly nothing will be left

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [6th December 1952]

4-p.m.

for them as margin. For this, there can be only one or two explanations. Either the figures given by the Government, namely, 13 annas 4.5 pies per mile is false or it must be due to something else. They can say that although they have given this figure of 13 and odd annas as the operating cost, in actuality it is far less. The only explanation they can give for it is that there is a lot of corruption, bribery and all that and that is why the operating cost is greater. I hope the Government will not come forward and give themselves this certificate of corruption as far as the City Transport operation is concerned. Obviously, even from the statement made by the Hon. Dr. Krishna Rao it is clear that most of the buses that are operating in the whole State to-day are not able to make both ends meet. That is the categorical statement made by the Hon. Minister for Industries. Under such circumstances, if we ask them to come forward and pay more by way of taxes, what will happen is this. It is not as if on account of philanthropic motives that anybody will come forward to pay this tax and it is not philanthropy that operates in our economic life. Let us not forget that. The Hon. Chief Minister talked of philanthropy. I am sure that will not play its part here and it is not the prime mover of our economic life. Of course, there may be one or two people who may come forward and give for a public cause. But, no capitalist will do that. So long as capitalism exists in our country and so long as the present economy exists there is no philanthropy which is running through the economic life of the people. Then what will be the effect of this measure? The effect of this will be that those people who are not able to stand competition and those who are running into loss will naturally go out of existence and they will be gobbled up by the bigger capitalists like the smaller fish being gobbled up by the bigger fish. This is the normal economic law that is operating in the capitalist society to-day. Then how do you say that in this Madras State alone this capitalist law will not operate in our economic life and that something else is going to happen. I know why the Government are so insistent on that. The Government say that this is a tax on bus operators who could very well afford to pay. Some of those on the Government side who supported this Bill are bus operators. They have given figures to show that the bus industry is not profitable, but nonetheless they have supported the Bill. Why have they supported it? Because they want to swallow up the small operators and establish their monopoly. Once they get a monopoly, they know how to deal with Government, how to get over the police and how to make blackmarket money. The moment somebody gets a monopoly, the methods by which he operates are far more terrible. Some people might support this measure from that angle. The T.V.S. or the A.B.T. or some other transport concern might monopolise the bus transport of the whole State. Are we to-day interested in creating monopolies? The Congress Election Manifesto says that the Congress party will see to it that accumulation of wealth in a few hands does not take place. Do the Government stand by that policy? How can we be a party to

6th December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

a Bill which will produce exactly the opposite result namely creation of monopolistic interests as far as bus transport industry is concerned?

"The Hon. Chief Minister tells us that we are wearing masks. I would like to show what mask he or the Government wears. They say that the tax is on bus operators and that it will not affect bus passengers and ask us why we should bother about it. Is it true? If that is so, why did not the Government accept in the Select Committee the amendment which said that under any circumstances the passenger fares should not be raised beyond the present level? In fact, the Government refuse to accept the position. We know that the passenger fares in many places to-day are 5 pies and 6 pies per mile. The maximum permissible under the Motor Vehicles Act is 7 pies. There is nothing in this Bill to prevent the bus operators from raising the fares from 5 or 6 pies to 7 pies. To say that the tax will fall only on the operators and that the burden will not be passed on to the passengers is not correct.

"We know from time immemorial that the moment the profits of bus operators or industrialists are pinched, the moment they earn less than the average profits or incur losses, they attack first the consumers and then the working classes. The staff is retrenched and their wages, dearness allowance and bonus are reduced. This is a historical fact which nobody can refute. Can it be said that by virtue of this Bill the operators will not attack the workers? Will the Hon. Chief Minister give a guarantee? Absolutely not. After all, wages are dependent on profits. To say that this tax affects only the bus operators is not true. When we point out the truth, we are said to have some mask around our face! That the passengers or the workers or both will be attacked is the naked truth and there is no use in hiding it."

MR. SPEAKER:—"How much more time does the Leader of the Opposition want?"

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I will finish in five or ten minutes."

"The Hon. Chief Minister said: 'There is a deficit in the budget and it may even run to the tune of 10 crores of rupees. What are we to do? We have not got the money. We have asked the Central Government. But the Finance Minister of the Central Government was rather embarrassed.' I would like to ask him this very clear question. The country is passing through an economic crisis. Can the Government to-day give an undertaking that by these measures they will be able to stave off that economic crisis? The more the people's purchasing power is attacked, the more the economic crisis will intensify. The Hon. Chief Minister spoke as if he alone had got all sympathy for the handloom weavers and not the Communists. He showered tons and tons of sympathy upon them through radio speeches and through speeches outside and in this Assembly. This question has been before the Government from the month of March onwards. What is

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [6th December 1952]

the actual relief that the handloom weavers have got to-day? Has that sympathy prevented the 45 lakhs of handloom weavers from giving up their homes and running away as destitutes? Therefore, it is not a question of sympathy; it is a question of concrete measures taken to alleviate distress. We know that their distress cannot be alleviated so long as the Government follow their present policy. They talk of five-year plans and all that. Here is a terrific economic crisis overtaking the Government. During the last five years, industry after industry has been collapsing. To-day small industries are closing down and business is getting shattered. Why? Precisely because the purchasing power of the common man is completely shattered because of certain fundamental, social and economic relations that are existing in society. Obviously the Government are not prepared to shatter those social and economic relations. Without disturbing the basic foundations, the Government want us to render help. They are asking us to do the impossible. They are following a policy which is in the interests of the landlord and I say this despite the Tanjore Tenancy Bill. They are yoking the economy of this country to the economy of Britain and America. There are many British industrialists who are taking away from this country hundreds of crores of rupees year after year. It does not matter if the State Government are not responsible. They are chips of the same block; they belong to the same Congress party which is running the Government in the Centre. The policy of the Centre is not to disturb the present social and economic relations, and they give all sorts of excuses to perpetuate the present condition. Without changing these conditions, the economic problems cannot be solved. Are we wrong if we come to the conclusion that in order to change these basic conditions so that the people of this country may go from prosperity to prosperity and plan for a secure and prosperous future, this Government has got to be destroyed? We do want to destroy this Government. There is no question about it. I am not using the word in any physical sense. I am saying it in the sense that the Government has to be removed and instead an alternative Government which would put forward alternative measures and which would ensure the prosperity of the people should be formed. Shattering to pieces the present foundations of society has got to take place. When we talk of shattering the foundations of society, I am not asking that all industrialists should be expropriated. (Interruption). Unless this country's economic foundations are shattered—the feudal relations are shattered—we cannot do anything. What are we to do then? Within the framework of these feudal relations, a terrible drain is taking place. The British imperialists, the B & C Mills, the Harvey Mills, and hundreds of others are taking away Rs. 120 crores year after year. It is stated that we must somehow or other solve this problem, and that the Central Government does not come to our rescue. If the bus operators are taxed, they will pass the tax on to the people as much as possible, and in cases where it is not possible to do so, they will pass it on to their workers by cutting down their wages, or they will resort to retrenchment or rationalization by taking off buses

6th December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

from the roads. If the Government get into a mire, we can pull them out. If they are determined to get into the mire, then the world cannot help them and nobody can help them. (Cheers.) That is the present position. Trade and industry are going down. The economic crisis is deepening day by day. The earning capacity of the people is going down. The gross income of the industry is going down year after year. The Hon. Dr. Krishna Rao has looked into the figures, and he even now says that he realises the position. What is the prospect for the future with the deepening of the economic crisis before us? The bus traffic is going to be far less. Is there any guarantee that it will increase? Can anybody come forward and say that the bus traffic will increase? Can any Hon. Minister come forward and say that the bus traffic in future will be more than what it is to-day? Nobody can give that guarantee. The prospect is very bleak for trade and industry with the existing policies of the Government. Therefore, it will be a further worsening of the situation. It means more buses will be taken off the roads. This means that our economic condition will be further disrupted, and that it will lead to the ruination of the already disrupted economy of our people. That is why, Sir, we oppose this Bill. We are interested in seeing that our people are enabled to make progress and lead the country forward in its march to prosperity and not retard that progress. We are opposing this Bill for this reason. When I say 'we' I mean the entire Opposition of the United Democratic Front. It is not the Communists alone, but all the people sitting on this side of the House that oppose this Bill. The Government cannot deceive anybody by saying that only the Communists are opposing this Bill, because truth cannot be hidden.

"There is another specific reason for my supporting the amendment. The Hon. the Chief Minister said that after all this Bill had already been discussed, and asked 'why do you want to refer it to a select committee'? Whenever we discuss things, a certain procedure is followed. The public have a right to have their say on Bills. In fact they place their views before the select committee by means of memoranda. When this new Bill was brought forward was it placed before the public to give their views? No such thing took place. Therefore, the select committee was nothing but a farce, I would say. It was not a real select committee. But this fact will be suppressed. It is said that all these things had been discussed by the select committee. That again is a mask. At any rate it is not the whole truth. It hides the truth. Personally, I am opposed to this Bill. In order to ensure that there is proper discussion of this Bill, let us see what others have got to say about this Bill. Let us take evidence. Let us get the opinion of the operators. Let us go into their balance sheets. If their balance sheets are found to be false, let us unmask those figures and find out the correct figures. Let us go into all their figures before committing this House . . . (Interruption.) Sir, I support the amendment of the hon. Member Sri T. Viswanatham to refer the Bill to a select committee." (The cheers.)

[6th December 1952]

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard many good speeches from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Ramamurthi. But I hope, he will pardon me if I tell him that in spite of the repeated cheers that he received from his supporters, his present speech was not one of his best or fiery speeches. The reasons may be two-fold. Whether the added responsibility of being the Leader of the Opposition has to a certain extent removed the fire in his arguments, or, if I may be permitted to say, whether the new responsibility he undertook this morning (laughter) has lowered his rhetorical standards, I am afraid I am not in a position to assess. I hope he will pardon me for having mentioned this, and I congratulate him on his new venture (laughter). I hope his new partner will certainly not keep him so fiery in the years to come, but will keep him cool in matters political and domestic.” (Laughter.)

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ It was not a maiden speech. It was a married speech.” (Laughter.)

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ It was his maiden speech as the Leader of the Opposition. Sir, I am not a lawyer. But I have heard it said that if two lawyers have no material to argue, they abuse one another. That is what the hon. Gentleman Mr. Ramamurthi has been doing. So far as I have been able to follow the speeches of the top leaders of the Opposition, I see that no thought has been bestowed on the merits of the Bill, but certain extraneous factors, which have nothing to do with the Bill, have been brought in. Therefore, I take it that, having nothing to speak about this Bill, they spoke of everything else. In the first instance let me correct the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi that what I said was right and what the Hon. the Chief Minister said also was right. I said that the bus operators were not to-day making the profits they used to make previously. This is absolutely correct. The Hon. the Chief Minister said that bus operators were making tons of money previously. These two statements are correct. There is nothing wrong in them, and I do not see any inconsistency in our statements. We are both consistent in our statements. There is no point in putting into my mouth words which I did not say and attributing intentions to me which I never intended. The hon. Member Mr. Kalyanasundaram was telling yesterday that the Hon. the Minister for Transport was a good man, but that he was going to be misguided by business men and operators. Sir, I have lived for fifty years in the City, I have thriven in spite of these business men, and I know how to deal with them. The only reason which makes the Government bring forward this Bill is to bridge the gap in the budget. The deficit of about Rs. 5 crores has to be covered and this is a duty cast upon the Government. This is one of the measures brought forward to bridge the gap. We many bring in other measures also. I want to make it clear that we are not trying to help the big bus operators in the sense that the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi said. He has said that though to-day I may be trying to help the

6th December 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

small bus owner, ultimately it may result in driving away from the scene of activity all the honest and small bus owners, and owing to the fact that some large fleet owners have got more money or their overhead expenses are less, ultimately the big operators will be benefited. I can tell him, Sir, that that is not our intention. Our intention is genuine. There is no side-tracking the issue, as the hon. Member Mr. Kalyanasundaram said. The bus operators, I still maintain, are not at present making the profits which they did make. But they are making enough profits to pay the levy under this Bill. Are they not paying income-tax? In the City of Madras, how many bus operators are there who are not paying income-tax? When people pay income-tax, then it means there is income. They will not, therefore, go out of the field. The hon. Member Mr. Vinayakam said 'why kill the goose that lays the golden egg'. It is not we who are killing the goose, but the real position is that, while the goose is willing to lay the golden egg, the Opposition is making a suggestion to kill it, or is putting the idea of suicide into its head. (Laughter.) That is very wrong. We are confident that the bus-owners can pay this tax. They are still paying income-tax. So, there is no point in saying that they are likely to go out of the field. There are people who threaten us, 'If you bring in this Bill, we will take our fleet off the road.' I take the challenge. If my friends go, there are hundreds more willing to come into the field. The hon. Member Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar said that the gate-crashing for permits had disappeared. I say there is still gate-crashing. Let the authorities advertise a new route. There will be twenty people applying for it through their lawyers, paying them fees. If the decision is adverse, the aggrieved party will appeal to the C.R.T.B., engaging a lawyer and paying him amply. If their decision is also adverse, then that party will appeal to the Government, engaging a lawyer. My Hon. Colleague the Finance Minister says that if they do not find a remedy in all these processes, there is the writ of the High Court. It is always available. Is this not gate-crashing? From the moment a new route is put on the map till the permit is finally given to some one or other, the amount of money that is spent by the bus-owners is stupendous.

4-20
P.M.

"Then, very often permits are sold for handsome figures and cases of overloading are brought to the notice of the Government day after day. I ask this question. 'If there is no profit, why is there this transfer of permit? Why is there this overloading? Why is there this gate-crashing?' My point, therefore, is that there is money in the business, though not to the extent there was in 1948. It does not, therefore, matter if the bus-owners spend some more money out of their income. Hence I feel that this talk of the bus-owner not being able to pay this tax is not a completely correct picture.

"Now, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Sri Ramamurthi, and some other hon. Members raised a scare that this tax would adversely affect the passengers. I say it cannot affect them.

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [6th December 1952]

The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked me whether the Government could give an assurance that the bus operators would not be permitted to raise the existing fares. I may tell him that the maximum rate of fare now permissible under the Act is 7 pies per mile. But still there are many people who are charging only 6½ pies, 6 pies, and 5 pies per mile. I ask the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, 'Is there anything in the law which prevents them from raising the rate of fare to 7 pies per mile even now?' If they are not raising it to 7 pies per mile, the reason is obvious. One operator wants to cut out a rival who tries to come into the field. Therefore, that big operator brings down the charges to such an extent that it makes it impossible for the ordinary people to compete with him. Therefore, this lowering of fares is not intended to help the poor passenger but to cut out competitors. In these circumstances, it is unfair to say that this tax will adversely affect the passengers. Even to-day the law does not prohibit the raising of fares up to 7 pies per mile. Therefore, we can only give an assurance that we will see that no operator is permitted to charge more than 7 pies per mile. (Interruption.) If under the existing law, the bus operator is permitted to charge up to 7 pies per mile, how can we prevent it now?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Even under the existing Act, the rate can be raised up to 7 pies per mile."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Even without our passing this Bill, the bus operators can raise the rate of fare up to 7 pies per mile with impunity, in spite of our saying that they earn profits. So, if they do it, the Government are not responsible for it. The Government only tell them, 'If you like, you can do it. If you still do not like, you need not do it.' My friends among bus-owners say that, even if this tax is introduced, they are not likely to raise the rates of fares, because there is always the law of competition operating."

"The next point is how this tax affects the man in the street. He will still go in for this bus because the fare is not going to be raised beyond 7 pies per mile. Therefore, we need not worry about the bogey raised that this tax is going to be passed on to the passenger."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Is it a bogey? "

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" If the rate is raised from 5 pies to 7 pies per mile, I want to know whether the Hon. Minister will call it a bogey. He may not agree, but let him not call it a bogey."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I cannot allow such interruptions."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Am I not entitled to call what I do not agree with as a 'bogey'? I claim it is not unparliamentary. I still say that I consider it a bogey."

6th December 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

“ My next point is whether this tax is going to affect labour. Hon. Members Messrs. Kalyanasundaram and Kamamurthi raised the possibility of this being a sort of labour retrenching machinery. I have got some figures with me. If we take a fleet of 25 buses, a tax at the rate of 6 annas will increase the running cost for a year by less than 5 pies per mile which is less than 4 per cent of what is claimed to be the present operating cost. I claim that this 4 per cent increase in the operating cost will not be a sufficient cause for sending the labourer out. Even if he is sent out, will the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Sri Ramamurthi, keep quiet? Will he not raise a hue and cry? Even to-day if a bus operator wants to send out a labourer on the plea that he has not enough money to pay, can anyone object to it? I am telling hon. Members that every bus operator has even now got the right to say, ‘ I am losing. I do not want so many employees, conductors, cleaners and drivers. So, I am going to retrench them.’ The Industrial Tribunals will uphold the action if they are satisfied that the retrenchment is effected not for the purpose of victimization but for financial reasons. The fear that hon. Members expressed that labour and consumer would be affected need not arise, because this condition of affairs is always there and this Bill is not going to add one more nail in the coffin.

“ The next point raised by the hon. Gentleman Sri K. P. Gopalan is about the windfall for this Government from the Centre. When he was saying it, my mouth really watered. I was wondering when I was going to get this windfall from the Centre. The hon. Gentleman was talking about the share of petrol tax and excise duty on spare parts. I was myself present at the conference which took place recently in Delhi, and I can assure the House that if we get that legitimate sum of Rs. 3 crores from the Centre, we shall not resort to this taxation. The hon. Gentleman Sri Gopalan seemed to know more about it than I and he seemed to be more hopeful of getting that sum of Rs. 3 crores from the Centre. But so far as I am aware, we are not going to get it in the near future. Therefore, let us not look forward to that windfall. Let us be satisfied with the little amount that we are going to get from this tax.

“ Regarding the loan that was raised by us, it was stated by some hon. Member that it was meant for revenue purposes. I should like to say that we raised that loan for financing capital works and that it cannot be used for improving the ways and means position.

“ One hon. Member said that the taxation in Madras was the highest. I have to correct that impression. Hon. Members know that there is the Central Road Transport Advisory Council which is a body of businessmen presided over by a very distinguished Engineer. That Council has said that the motor tax in Madras is the ceiling. The next body is the Transport Advisory Council. This Council has said that the Madras rate should be the ceiling. I can straightway say that the Madras Government did not agree

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [6th December 1952]

with the proposition that the rate of Madras tax was the ceiling. On the other hand, they reserve the right to change the rate of tax whenever they want. The Transport Advisory Council held the view that the Madras rate should be the ceiling lest the other States, which were levying less, should follow suit. As a matter of fact, Bombay, Uttar Pradesh and the Punjab have all followed our example and rates of taxation in those States have come up to our level.

“ There is one more point which I would like to touch upon. The hon. Member Dr. K. B. Menon said that the money collected from this tax should be used for the improvement of roads. It is a good suggestion. We pleaded at the meeting of the Central Advisory Board that legitimately the money that we got from the motor transport should be used for the improvement and laying of roads. In all States of India the money they spent on roads was much less than what they collected as tax on motor vehicles. Only in the State of Madras we get Rs. 3 crores by way of revenue and we spend Rs. 6 crores on roads. Hon. Members may ask, ‘ Are the roads good? They are not good because there are too many miles of roads in our country. But all the money that we get from the motor vehicles goes back to the roads, may be not directly, but through the administrative machinery. Therefore, even there, the Madras Government must be held to be free from blame. We do not levy any octroi duty and we have no tolls. Therefore, from the point of view of collection of money from the operator, the Madras Government will be considered, at any rate by most people, to be fair and reasonable.

“ Then, it was suggested, ‘ Why not tax the motor car? ’ An hon. Member said, ‘ Leave off this lorry. There are 10,000 private cars. Double the quarterly tax on them ’. I want to correct him. There are 30,000 motor cars. But even if we double the tax on them, the income we get will be not more than Rs. 15 lakhs. Well, is it worth while to make a legislation for getting Rs. 15 lakhs and incur the displeasure of 30,000 people? We could rather incur the displeasure of these 7,000 people and get a sum of Rs. 2 crores.

“ The erstwhile Leader of the Opposition referred to the need for a Select Committee. I can only say that this Bill that is before the House is the product of the Select Committee. It is the judgment of the Select Committee. In the Select Committee, barring the question of lorries, which is a very minor matter, all other questions were discussed in detail. We had representations from the public, we had representations from individuals. We had representations from other responsible people. Those people who came to give evidence on the surcharge on bus fares were directly asked what they thought about a tax on them. Even at that time we had decided that we should shift the incidence of taxation.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The Select Committee did not decide that.”

6th December 1952]

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I said, that we decided and not the Select Committee. Evidence was taken on both these matters. If people did not agree to this tax. I only sympathize with them. Who will agree to be taxed and who will agree to commit suicide? I am saying all these things only to show that the Select Committee had evidence on this point also. So it is the judgment of the Select Committee and there is nothing special about it for sending it to a Select Committee again.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister one thing. He said that in the Select Committee, we addressed ourselves to this question and that it was already decided to shift the incidence of taxation to the bus operators. May I submit that so far as the non-official Members of the Select Committee were concerned, we did not know that the Government had intended to shift the burden. We had no idea about this and therefore we did not put the necessary questions to the witnesses and elicit their opinion, except a few casual questions. Had the Government this idea in view even at that time, then they ought to have informed us then, when the witnesses were present. So, I want to correct this misapprehension on the part of the Ministry, Sir.”

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I don't agree with the erstwhile Leader of the Opposition when he says that the Bill should be sent back to a Select Committee. I submit it is a waste of time. We have done all the investigation possible. In fact, I must take this opportunity to thank the erstwhile Leader of the Opposition for the co-operation that he and his party gave and for the amount of questions that they put not only to us but also to the bus operators. They got all possible information against the Bill from the bus operators. Therefore, there is no point in sending this Bill again to a Select Committee, unless it is, if I may use the term and if it is not unparliamentary, dilatory tactics.

“ Some hon. Member said that the Government were not collecting tax from as many as 2,000 buses or so. I am afraid it is a wrong figure. The difference is not 2,000 as mentioned in the figure quoted by him. I may tell the House that these figures are available from the Regional Transport Authority office, the Police Commissioners and the District Superintendents of Police. In the last case, there has been a mixing of two or three items of the same category. Probably that is the reason for the hon. Member's reference to that figure. The difference will not be 2,000, but it may be something like 500 or 600. Sir, it may be that all these 500 or 600 buses may not operate on the road and according to the present Act, if buses are not on the road and if we collect tax from them for the purpose of satisfying some hon. Members, then we may have to refund the tax if it is proved that those buses were not on the road. All the alternative suggestions referred to by the hon. Members are not tenable and sustainable

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [6th December 1952]

and they will not produce enough finance for this Government. I have nothing more to add except to repeat my request once more that this House may please agree to consider the proposal on its merits."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry the Hon. Minister has not been able to convince us. One point on which I have been harping and most of the other Members have been harping is to take away the political aspects altogether which have been, if I may say so, unnecessarily introduced by the Hon. Chief Minister. What is it that we have to consider? We must take into account the capacity of the operators, the bus and lorry operators, their income and expenditure and see whether out of the margin they can pay one anna or nine pies or whatever it is, according to the Government amendment. I would like to ask the Hon. Chief Minister, Hon. Finance Minister and Hon. Industries and Transport Minister to take the case of a fleet of 34 buses. What is the income of the fleet and what is its expenditure? After paying all other taxes, what is the margin left and out of that margin, will the owner be capable of paying the present tax? That is the question which we have to consider. This does not involve any greater principle of economics or politics. I want to know whether the Government have these figures with them. I have given a particular figure. If you believe in my figure, then there is no case for the present Bill. If you don't believe those figures of mine, then let us sit together and consider all these aspects and arrive at the correct figure. This cannot be done here, but has to be done in a Select Committee. Therefore, there is a *prima facie* case for referring the Bill to a Select Committee. The assertions made by the Hon. Transport Minister and the dispute which he has entered into are positive proofs for the need for a Select Committee. It is not dilatory tactics. It will be dilatory tactics only if they close their eyes to facts. If they face facts, they will agree that it is absolutely essential to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. Let that Committee get at facts and see if the bus operators are capable of bearing this tax. I am quite ready to agree to any tax, which the tax-payer is able to pay. I hope the Government will accept my amendment without compelling us to press for a division."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Sir, I would like to know from the Hon. Minister how much money he is going to realize through this measure."

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" It will be between 80 and 90 lakhs of rupees."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member, Sri C. V. K. Rao withdrawing his amendment? "

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" No, Sir."

6th December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' For the word " at once ", occurring in the motion for consideration, *substitute* the words " this day six months ". ' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member, Sri K. P. Gopalan, withdrawing his amendment? "

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" I am not pressing my amendment. "

The amendment of hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members (list of names to be furnished later). ' "

The Motion was declared lost.

4.40
p.m.

A poll was demanded. The House divided thus :

Ayes.

Sri G. Latchanna.
" K. Appala Naidu.
" P. Bapu Naidu.
" B. Gangayya Naidu.
" K. V. Ramesam.
" P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
" K. Narayana.
" M. Srungaram.
" K. Venkatanarayana Dora.
" M. Gangappa.
" M. Pentannaaidu.
Dr. K. B. Menon.
Sri M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
" S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.
" P. V. R. Gajapathi Raju.
" C. V. Somayajulu.
" S. Pakkirisami Pillai.
Janab K. Moidu.
Sri K. V. S. Padmanabha Raju.
" K. Venkatakurmi Nayudu.
" C. Velukkan.
" G. Suryanarayana.
" H. B. Ari Gowder.
" P. Chinnama Reddi.
" K. S. Lakshminipathy Naicker.
" R. Rangaswamy Gounder.
" O. Chengam Pillai.
" M. Dharmalingam.
" M. Kalyanasundaram.
" K. T. Raju.
" K. P. Gopalan.
" P. Jeevanandam.
" S. Vadivelu.
" N. Sivaraj.
" A. K. Subbiah.
" K. V. Ramaswami.

Sri T. S. Ardhanari.
" P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
" P. Narasimha Reddi.
" N. Sivarami Reddi.
" D. Seetharamiah.
" C. H. Kanaran.
" K. Madhavan Nambiar.
" R. Krishnan.
" E. T. Kunhan.
" M. Hanumantha Rao.
" C. V. K. Rao.
" K. Rajagopala Rao.
" P. Venkatasiviah.
" P. Rama Rao.
" V. Rama Rao.
" T. Potha Raju.
" P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
" K. Malakondaiah.
" M. Narayanasamy.
" K. Venkaiah.
" P. Syamasundara Rao.
" B. Lakshminarasa Raju.
" G. Satyanarayana.
" G. Anjaneyulu.
" V. Sri Krishna.
" G. Joseph.
" D. Lakshmayya.
" M. Kune Rao.
" G. Nageshwara Rao.
" Alluri Venkataramaraju.
" R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
" K. Ranga Rao.
" K. Subba Reddi.
" Chandra Ramalingaiah.
" C. Prabhakara Choudary.
" G. Rama Rao.

[6th December 1952]

Ayes—cont.

Sri K. Govinda Rao.
 „ M. Veerabhadram.
 „ K. Vinayakam.
 „ S. Swayamprakasam.
 „ V. V. Ramasami.
 „ P. Rathinaswami Pillai.
 „ A. Senapathi Gounder.
 „ Mookkiah Thevar.
 „ M. Palaniandi.
 „ K. Krishna Rao.
 „ P. Rangaswami Reddiar.
 „ A. Veloo.
 „ M. P. Subramaniam.
 „ Mottaya Kudumban.
 „ M. Paramasivam.
 „ T. Lakshmi Narayana Reddi.
 „ D. K. Raja.
 „ P. Kandasamy Gounder.
 „ G. C. Kondayya.
 „ S. P. Thangavelu.
 „ K. R. Sambandam.
 „ S. Kasi Reddi.
 „ Saka Venkata Rao.
 „ B. Sankaraya.
 „ T. Nagi Reddi.
 „ Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.
 „ Y. Audinarayana Reddi.
 „ Bojja Appalasamy.
 „ S. Vemiah.
 „ R. Siddanna Gowd.
 „ K. Gajapathi Reddi.
 „ N. K. Palaniswamy.
 „ K. Ramiah Chowdary.
 „ M. Bapanayya.

Sri Y. V. Krishna Rao.
 „ P. Suryachandra Rao.
 „ N. Ramabhadra Raju.
 „ C. Subbarayudu.
 „ P. Kunhirama Kidav.
 „ D. Basivi Reddi.
 „ K. Bapanna Dora.
 „ K. Ramiah.
 „ C. Pulla Reddi.
 „ M. Lakshmanasamy.
 „ T. Viswanatham.
 „ P. Ramamurthi.
 „ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
 „ K. R. Viswanathan.
 „ N. Paramasivam.
 „ A. Govindasamy Nayakar.
 „ A. Ayyaru.
 „ V. K. Gopalakrishnan.
 „ K. C. Gopalan Unni.
 „ M. Manickasundaram.
 „ S. Kandaswamy Gounder.
 „ M. Venugopala Gounder.
 „ Kattimuthu.
 „ S. Radhakrishnan.
 „ A. Muthuswami.
 „ V. Sankaranarayana Menon.
 „ K. T. Sridharan.
 „ Narayana Kurup.
 „ M. Narayana Nambiar.
 „ O. Koran,
 „ C. Kunhirama Kurup.
 „ K. R. Narasa Raju.
 „ B. Subba Raju.
 „ G. Yallamanda Reddi.

*Noes.*4-50
p.m.

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
 „ A. B. Shetty.
 „ M. A. Manickavelu
 Naicker.
 Dr. U. Krishna Rao

Sri K. Rajaram.
 „ C. Rajam Ramaswami.
 „ P. G. Karuthiruman.
 „ B. K. Nallasamy.
 „ S. C. Virupakshiah.
 „ P. S. Nalla Gounder.
 „ P. G. Manickam.
 „ N. Mahalingam.
 „ R. Kuppuswami.
 „ V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.
 „ N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
 „ P. S. Rangaswamy Naidu.
 „ S. R. Arumugam.
 „ K. H. Bomman.
 „ M. K. Kempai Gounder.
 „ T. M. Kaliannan.
 „ M. P. Periaswami.
 „ A. Sambasivam.
 „ C. Lakshmana Kandar.
 Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu.
 The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan
 Nayar.

„ Dr. R. Nagan Gouda.
 Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
 „ T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ K. Koti Reddi.
 „ A. M. Sambandam.

Sri M. R. Ramachandran.
 „ O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ B. Parameswaran.
 „ V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
 „ S. Panchaksharam.
 „ A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.
 „ H. M. Jagannatham.
 Janab S. Khadir Sheriff.
 Sri A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
 „ R. Thangavelu.
 „ R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.
 „ M. Kandasamy Padayachi.
 „ L. Anandan.
 „ V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
 „ G. Vagheesam Pillay.
 „ A. S. Sahajanandam.
 „ O. A. Nanjappa.
 „ P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.
 „ S. Arumugam.
 „ K. S. Subramania Gounder.
 „ A. M. Ratnaswami.
 „ M. Marimuthu.
 Janab Mohamed Salih Maraikayar.
 The Hon. Sri V. C. Palanisami
 Gounder.

„ K. Venkataswamy Naidu.
 „ N. Sankara Reddi.
 „ D. Sanjeevayya.
 „ S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama
 Rao.

Dr. T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran.
 Sri M. S. Munisami Pillai.

6th December 1952]

Noes—cont.

Sri C. Chinnasami Naidu.	Sri Raja Meka Rangayya Appa Rao
„ S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.	Bahadur.
„ V. S. Sivaprakasam.	„ P. Gunnayya.
„ B. R. M. Muthu Thevar.	„ L. Lakshmana Das.
„ A. Ayyanar.	„ K. Suryanarayana.
„ V. Muthu.	„ H. Satyanarayana Dora.
„ A. S. Subbaraj.	„ P. Sangam Naidu.
„ S. Thinakaranamy Thevar.	„ T. C. Atchannaaidu.
„ R. Krishnaswami Naidu.	„ K. Balanarayana Reddi.
„ S. Jayaram Reddiyar.	„ P. Venkatasubbayya.
„ A. Vaikuntam.	„ K. V. Vema Reddi.
„ G. Govindan.	„ S. Narayanappa.
„ P. S. Krishnasamv Ayyangar.	„ K. Santhappa.
„ S. Ramasamy Naidu.	„ N. Gopala Menon.
„ Ar. A. Rm. Chockalingam Chettiar.	„ A. Appu.
„ P. Chellathurai.	„ Chudamani Deo.
„ N. Rajagopal.	„ M. Rajeswara Rao.
„ R. M. Palaniappan.	„ K. Varadachari.
„ A. Ramasamy Thevar.	„ A. Balarama Reddi.
„ T. K. Rama.	„ D. Ramabrahmam.
„ T. V. Sannasi.	„ K. Adikesavalu Naidu.
„ T. R. Varadan.	„ H. Ramalinga Reddi.
„ C. Muthiah Pillai.	„ G. Nagabhushanam.
„ S. Venkatarama Ayyar.	„ Ijari Sirasappa.
„ R. V. Swaminathan.	„ Kotra Basavana Goud.
„ I. K. Subramania Pillai.	„ S. Parameswarappa.
„ S. Chella Pandian.	„ M. Jaganathan.
„ K. T. Kosalram.	„ T. Chinmayya.
„ P. Urkavalan.	„ T. Malliah.
„ R. S. K. Pandian.	„ T. Anantha Pai.
„ T. Ganapathy.	„ Y. Manjaya Shetty.
„ M. G. Shankar.	„ K. Venkataramana Gowda.
„ Venugopalakrishnasamy.	„ K. Ishwara.
„ S. Somayajulu.	„ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
„ M. Chinnathambi Thevar.	„ B. Vaikunta Baliga.
„ P. Selvaraj.	Janab M. S. Mogral.
„ V. Arumugam.	Mr. B. Krishnamoorthy Row.
„ K. Ramasamy Doss.	„ W. J. Fernandez.
„ R. S. Arumugam.	Sri L. C. Pais.
„ A. Venkataramiah.	Janab K. Uppi.
„ A. Rami Reddi.	„ Kunhi Mohamed Shaffee.
„ N. Chenchurama Naidu.	„ K. M. Seethi.
„ P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.	Sri G. Samia Koorayar.
„ K. Shaumughara.	„ K. Venkata Setty.
„ G. Narayanasami Naidu.	„ N. Rathina Gounder.
„ S. R. V. P. Murthi Raju.	„ V. Chidanandam.
„ D. Narayana Raju.	„ Ch. Indriah.
„ Raja V. V. Krishnan Raju	„ K. Veeranna Padal.
Bahadur.	„ V. Balakrishnan.
„ T. Ramaswamy.	„ P. Satyanarayana Reddi.

Ayes 140 ; Noes 158.

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Now I am going to put the original ⁵ p.m. motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ That the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.’ ”

The motion was passed.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Now we will take the Bill clause by clause.”

[6th December 1952]

Clause 2.

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ అద్యక్షా, నేను నా సహరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. ఆ సహరణ ఇది—

‘Add the following at the end of sub-clause (d) :—

“and a representative of a fleet or company or a limited concern of stage carriage and public carrier vehicles.”’

రెండవ సెక్షన్ లోని sub-clause (d) కు చివర పై పదాలను చేర్చవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. ఒకటి రెండు లైసెన్సు పెట్టుకొని నడిపే చిన్న యజమానులను ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క నిబంధనలనుంచి మినహాయించవలెనని నేను కోరుతున్నాను. ఈనాడు పెద్ద పెద్ద భూస్వాములు ఈ ఊటారు రవాణాను హస్తగతం చేసుకుంటున్నారు. అందువల్ల ఈ చిన్న వ్యాపారస్తులు వారి పోటీనుంచి తట్టుకోవడం చాలా కష్టంగా ఉన్నది. ఈ అదనపు పన్నుకూడా విధించినట్లయితే చిన్న యజమానులు తమ బస్సులను అమ్ముకునిపోవలసి వస్తుంది. ఆ తరువాత వారి బస్సులకూడా పెద్ద operator లు కొనుక్కొంటారు. బస్ వ్యాపారం గుత్త వ్యాపారంగా మారకూడదు. పెద్ద ఆపరేటర్ల చేతులలో ఈ బస్ వ్యాపారం ఎన్నడూ ఉండరాదని నేను ఆశిస్తాను. మరొక మద్రాస్ కోస్టల్ లో వున్న లైసెన్సు యజమానులలో చిన్న చిన్న వ్యాపారస్తులు ఆ నేతమంది వున్నారు. వారిని ఈ పన్నునుంచి మినహాయించినందువల్ల ప్రభుత్వానికి వచ్చే నష్టమేమీ లేదు. ఈ చిన్న వ్యాపారములపై అదనపు పన్ను వేసి వసూలుచేసినట్లయితే వారికి ఎంతమాత్రం గిట్టుబాటుకాదు. తత్ఫలితంగా ఆ వ్యాపారస్తుడు తన బస్సులను ఇతరులకు అమ్మివేయవలసిన దుర్గతి ఏర్పడుతుంది. ఇప్పుడే పెద్ద పెద్ద fleet ఒకప్పుడు limited కంపెనీలవారు ఈ చిన్న వ్యాపారస్తులను చాలా ఇబ్బందులు పెడుతున్నారు. అనేకచోట్ల వారికి గిట్టుబాటు కానంతగా రేట్లు తగ్గించి నష్టం కలుగచేస్తున్నారు. ఉదాహరణకు మా జిల్లాలోని ఒక చిన్న వ్యాపారస్తుని విషయం తెలియజేస్తాను. అతడు ఒక మహమ్మదీయుడు. ఉన్న రెండు మూడేకాల భూమి అమ్ముకొని ఒక బస్ పెట్టుకొని వ్యాపారం ప్రారంభించదలచాడు. అయితే చాలాకాలం అతనికి రూట్ ఇవ్వబడలేదు. ఎక్కడ లంచాలు ముట్టజెప్పి ఎంతో వ్యయ ప్రయాసలకోర్కీ తుదకు రూట్ సంపాదించుకొన్నాడు. కాని తరువాత కొంతకాలానికి M.M. Ltd. వంటి పెద్ద పెద్ద బస్ కంపెనీలవారి పోటీకి తట్టుకొనలేక వ్యాపారం ముగించుకోవలసి వచ్చింది. ఇదేవిధంగా అనేకమంది చిన్న ఆపరేటర్లు నాశనమవుతున్నారు. విశేషంగా లాభాలు సంపాదిస్తున్న fleet ఓనర్లమీద, లిమిటెడ్ కంపెనీలమీద పన్ను వేయటానికి నా కేట్టి అభ్యంతరం లేదు. అయితే చిన్న వారిని మాత్రం అందుకు మినహాయించుటగా చేయవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈనాడు చిన్న యజమానులను పెద్ద కంపెనీలవారు కబళించి వేయాలని చూస్తున్నారు. కాబట్టి యీ శిస్తును వేయడంలో కొంత నివక్షణ చూపవలసి వున్నదని మరల ప్రభుత్వంవారికి మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

“అంతే కాకుండా ఆపరేటర్ అనే పదానికి కంపెనీల fleet ల ప్రతినిధులుగూడ అని అర్థంవచ్చే నా సహరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. ఈ సహరణ అంగీకరించడం చాలా అవసరమని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఒకటి రెండు బస్సులు పెట్టుకొని వ్యాపారం సాగిస్తున్న చిన్న లైసెన్సు యజమానులపై ఈ శిస్తు వేయవద్దని తిరిగి ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలియచేస్తున్నాను.”

6th December 1952]

* SRI V. RAMA RAO :—“ ఆధ్యక్షా, నేను ఈ సవరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. మోటార్ రవాణా వ్యాపారం పెద్దగుత్త వ్యాపారుల చేతుల్లో పూర్తిగా పడిపోకుండా వుండాలంటే చిన్న బస్ యజమానులపై ఈ పన్ను ఎంతమాత్రం విధించరాదు. అనేక మంది డ్రైవర్లు, కండక్టర్లు ఈ చిన్న వ్యాపారస్థులుగా వుంటున్నారు. ఉన్నది కాస్తా ఆమ్ముకోవో లేక ఎవరికొద్దైనా ఆస్తు తెచ్చుకోవో ఒకటి రెండు బస్సులు పెట్టుకొని జీవనోపాధికోసం తాపత్రయ పడుతున్నారు. ఈ పన్ను విధించినట్లైతే అటువంటి వారిని బస్ రవాణా రంగంనుంచి తొలగించి వేసిన వాళ్ళిలాతాము. వాళ్ళకు నిరుద్యోగము సంభవిస్తుంది. కాబట్టి అలాంటి వాళ్ళను మినహాయించవలసిన కోరుతూ ఈ సవరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid I cannot understand the meaning of the amendment. He has not made it clear. I think it is unnecessary because when we say ‘operator’ it means any person who is entered in the register. It includes the representative of the bus-owner also. It is redundant. I oppose the amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ As the hon. Member who moved the amendment is not in his seat it is deemed to have been withdrawn.”

Clause 2 was then put and carried.

Clause 3.

* SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I 5-10
move— p.m.

‘After the words “by public carrier vehicles” occurring in line 5, insert the words “excluding both the stage carriages and the public carrier vehicles owned and worked by the Co-operative Societies”.’

“ My amendment is very simple and it does not require any elaborate explanation. It aims at achieving two objects, namely, providing relief from taxation to the small number of co-operative societies mainly formed for the benefit of the ex-service men in this State. Secondly it seeks to encourage co-operative effort among motor workers which is also undoubtedly the policy of the Government. The number of these workers is increasing day by day and it is therefore necessary to assist these workers to form into co-operatives to be saved from the exploitation of capitalistic operators. There are about 17 co-operative societies started and engaged in running buses and lorries. Of these, 13 are exclusively run by ex-service men and the total membership of these societies is about 797. Of the rest one is said to be dormant, one is working at Kurnool, and another is working at Pudukkottai. These two are running about 20 buses. By exempting the co-operative societies there will not be much reduction in the revenue derived from this taxation. On the other hand it is bound to help about 800 families depending on these societies. The amendment, as I said is a simple one and is intended to help co-operative effort among poor and middle class workers. It will not affect the

[Sri Pragada Kotaiah] [6th December 1952]

revenues expected to be derived from this taxation but will help the 800 poor families. I therefore hope that the Government would accept this amendment."

The amendment was duly seconded.

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, however deserving the case of the co-operative societies might be, as made out by the hon. Member, I feel, an exemption in one case will land the Government in very difficult and delicate position of having to choose others for exemption. There might be others running buses on routes parallel to the railway line and they might bring other difficulties. So I think we must be fair to everybody and treat everybody in the manner."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' After the words " by public carrier vehicles " occurring in line 5, insert the words " excluding both the stage carriages and the public carrier vehicles owned and worked by the Co-operative Societies " . . . "

The amendment was lost.

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

' In the opening paragraph of this clause, for the words " at the rate of one anna in the rupee on the fares and freights payable to the operators of such stage carriages and public carrier vehicles " substitute the following :—

" at the rate of nine pies in the rupee on the fares and freights payable to the operators of such stage carriages and at the rate of six pies in the rupee on the freights payable to the operators of such public carrier vehicles. " ' "

" I need not make a long speech on this amendment. It was suggested that if the rates were at least reduced it would not be such a big burden on the operators. The rates have been reduced and I hope it will not be a big burden as people have been making it out to be. I hope the House will accept the amendment."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose the amendment though the Government have, in view of the representations made to them and in view of the trust they placed, not on the false accounts of the operators, but on the pressure brought on them by some Members on the Government side, been able to reduce the rate by three pies. They have also made a distinction between public carriers and the Stage carriages. So far so good. But my contention is that they have not gone far enough. For example I have the accounts of a fleet operator who runs 34 buses. His income is estimated at about 6 lakhs of rupees and odd. His total saving before paying income-tax is only about 31 thousands. His total margin after paying the taxes already

6th December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

in existence and that proposed to be levied now, will be only about 5 to 6 thousands rupees. That means that that operator who has invested lakhs of rupees on running 34 buses will be left only with a margin of 5 to 6 thousand rupees for the whole year. Is it expected that a person who invests more than six lakhs of rupees should have a profit of less than 6 thousand rupees? Is this the margin allowed in any other industry? Will it suffice for replacements? Is this the margin that the Government think they can allow to the private operators? Here I am not referring to small operators owning 2 or 3 buses. I am referring to the big operators. Do they want these to thrive or not, I ask? Let them compare the saving which they are making in respect of their own bus service which has more than 320 buses or with that of the T.V.S., or any other big operator. What is the margin left? From their accounts I say that the margin is $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 per cent. If they now take away from these operators 9 pies, the margin will work out to something less than one per cent. It is inequitable to ask people to invest large sums of money on public utility services and ask them to be content with one per cent margin. This is not the overall margin. That one per cent margin must be used for replacement of tools and sometimes for replacement of vehicles also. I therefore submit that it is very hard. The Government amendment does not meet the requirements at all. That is why we suggested referring the Bill to a Select Committee so that it can go into the merits. But the Government are adamant and they do not want to go into the merits. I am placing the accounts of a bus operator running 34 buses year after year and month after month, by the rupee and would ask the Hon. Minister to see whether it is wrong or whether it is incorrect and tell me whether there is any margin. We cannot expect an operator who has invested more than 6.0 lakhs to live and carry on upon a margin of about Rs. 5,000 to Rs. 6,000 after paying this new tax. I therefore submit, Sir, the Government must consider and reduce the rate by something. Otherwise they will not be doing justice. The Government may get a majority of ten or twenty and pass the clause. But I do not think they will pass it with the consent of the people of this State."

5-20
p.m.

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"On a point of order, ఈ సవరణను చర్చించే విషయంలో ఒక క్రమాన్ని అనుసరించడం న్యాయమని నా అభిప్రాయం."

MR. SPEAKER :—"ఆధ్యక్ష అని చెప్పండి."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"ఆధ్యక్ష! ఈ క్లాజుకు అనేక మంది గౌరవ సభ్యులు సవరణలను ఇచ్చారు. అయితే కొంతమంది ఆణాను మూడు కాసులుగాను, మరికొంతమంది 0-0-6, మరి కొందరు ఒక 0-0-3 కి తగ్గించవలెనని సవరణలను ప్రతిపాదించవలసి వుంది. మరొక సభ్యుడు దానిని ఒక దమ్మిడికి కూడా తగ్గించవలెనని సవరణను ఇచ్చి వున్నారు. అయితే ముందుగా ఒక దమ్మిడికి తగ్గించమని వున్న సవరణను, తరువాత కాసికి తగ్గించమని, ఆ తరువాత 0-0-6 కు తగ్గించమని ఉన్న సవరణలను ప్రతిపాదించవలసి వున్నది. ఈ సవరణలలో

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [6th December 1952]

వేటిని ప్రభుత్వం వారు అంగీకరించకపోయినట్లయితేనే వారు ప్రతిపాదించిన 0-0-9 కు తగ్గించాలనే సవరణను ఆమోదించాలి."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" He says there are other amendments reducing the rate of one anna to six pies, three pies and one pie. Therefore he suggests that these amendments may be taken up before the Government amendment is put to vote."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then let the hon. Members Sri Venkateswarlu, Sri Ramamurthi and Sri Seetharamiah move their amendments and I will put them one by one to the vote of the House before the Government amendment."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" అధ్యక్షా! నేను నా పేరున ప్రస్తుత సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. ఆ సవరణ ఇది—

'In line 5, for the words "one anna in the rupee," substitute the words "six pies" in the rupee.'

నేను యిచ్చిన మరో సవరణకూడా ఉంది. అయితే దానిలో ఈ రేటును చూడు వైసలకు తగ్గించవలెనని కూడా కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ సవరణల యొక్క ముఖ్యోద్దేశం యిది. ఈ నాడు బస్ ఆపరేటర్లు, ఆందులో ముఖ్యంగా 1, 2 బస్సులు పెట్టుకొని నడిపే వారికి చెప్పబోతున్నంత బాధాభరిత రావడంలేదు. ఈ విషయాన్ని శ్రీ విశ్వనాథంగారు తెలియ జేశారు. డాక్టరు యు. కృష్ణారావుగారు కూడా ఈ బిల్లును ప్రవేశ పెడుతూ బస్ యజమానులకు యిచ్చినంత వచ్చినంత లాభం రావటం లేదని తెలియ జేశారు. మంత్రిగారు చెప్పిన దానిని బట్టి చూచినప్పటికీ కూడా ఈ ఆదనపు పన్ను ఎంతమాత్రం సబబైనది కాదు అని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. బస్ యజమానులు income-tax లు మొదలైనవి కడుతున్నారు గనుక ఈ పన్నును కూడా కట్టమని చెప్పడం విమత న్యాయం కాదు. బస్ యజమానులు ఇంత ఆదనపు పన్నును యిచ్చుకొన గలరా లేదా అనే విషయాన్ని మంత్రిగారు గ్రహించాలి. ఇదివరకటికన్న యిప్పుడు లాభాలు తక్కువగా వస్తున్నాయి అని వంక చెబుతూ మరొక ప్రక్క పన్నులను ఆభివృద్ధి చేస్తాం అంటే ఆందులో ఎంతమాత్రమైనా సబబుసందర్భం ప్రస్తుతానికి అని అడుగు తున్నాను. మంత్రిగారు చెప్పే దానిసారాంశం అంతాయింది. మాజీ డిప్యూటీ లాంటి వారి మొత్తం ఆదాయం ఇతరులు లాంటి వారికి చెప్పే దానితో మాకు సంబంధం లేదు. మేము వస్తుండితమన్న లాంటి వారి భర్తీ చేయదలిచాము. అందు నిమిత్తం విదోవిధంగా పన్నులను వసూలు చేయాలి. ఈ పన్ను వసూలు చేయడంలో న్యాయాన్వయ వివక్షణ ఉండవద్దా అని వారిని ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నాను. ఎట్టి పన్నులను వసూలు చేయాలి, ఎవరివద్దనుంచి పన్నులు వసూలు చేస్తే మంచిది, ఆదనపు పన్ను చెల్లించే శక్తి tax-payer కు ఉన్నదా లేదా అనే విషయం వారు గుర్తించాలి. అసలే పన్ను భారంతో కృంగిపోయిపోతున్న బస్ యజమానుల మీద ఇంకా ఆదనపు పన్ను వేస్తున్నారు. పోనీ, పెట్టుబడిదారులైన నే ఈ పన్ను పడుతుందా అంటే అదిలేదు. 1, 2 బస్సులు పెట్టుకొని కాలక్షేపంచేసే వారివైకూడా ఈ ఆదనపు పన్ను విధింపబడు తుంది. అయినప్పటికీ ఎవరితలకాయ బద్దలుకొట్టవలసి వచ్చినప్పటికీ ఆదనపు పన్ను వసూలు చేస్తాం, మాకు డబ్బు కావాల అని ఆనడం న్యాయం కాదు."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, I never said what the hon. Member Sri P. Venkateswarlu said now. I did not say that I wanted to take money even by knocking one's head."

6th December 1952]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ తలకాయ బద్దలు కొట్టడమంటే మంత్రిగారు బొతికంగా ప్రతి బస్ యజమానిని కొట్టబోతున్నారు అని మాత్రం వారు అర్థంచేసుకోరాదు. ఈ మాటలకున్న ఆర్థంవేరు. ఈ విషయం వారికి కూడా తెలుసు. అయితే ఏదో మాటవర్గకు వారు నేను ఉపయోగించిన పదానికి అభ్యంతరం తెలిపారు. తలకాయ బద్దలుకొట్టడం అనేదానికి అర్థంఏమిటో మనవి చేస్తాను. ఈ బస్ వ్యాపారంమీద ముఖ్యంగావారు చెబుకొడుతున్నారన్నమాట. దాని తలమీద వారు చెబుకొడుతున్నారన్నమాట. ఆ వ్యాపారాన్ని ఊణదశకు తీసుకొని రావటానికి వారు ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నారన్నమాట. ఈ విషయం రాజగోపాలాచారి గారికూడా తెలిసినటువంటిదే.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ మీరు చెప్పేది కృష్ణారావుగారిని గురించి చెప్పండి.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఈ ప్రభుత్వాన్ని నడిపేవారుఅంతా రాజగోపాలాచారిగారే గనుక, ఈ వస్తువు విధింపదలచినదివారే గనుక వారుకూడా ఈ విషయాలను గమనించవలసినదని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ అదనపున్న వేయడంవల్ల చిన్నచిన్నబస్సు ఆపరేటర్లకు ఎంతో నష్టం సంభవిస్తుంది. ఈ బస్సు ఆపరేటర్లు ప్రయాణీకులవద్దనుంచి వసూలుచేయటానికి ప్రయత్నిస్తారు. దానిని ప్రభుత్వం ఎంతమాత్రం అరికట్టలేదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లివల్ల చిన్నచిన్నబస్సు ఆపరేటర్లే కాక ప్రయాణీకులుకూడా చాలా భాగలుపడుతారు. సరుకు రవాణారేట్లుకూడా పెరిగిపోతాయి. తప్పనిసరిగా ప్రయాణీకులు, ప్రజాసామాన్యం బాధపడవలసివస్తుంది. ముఖ్యమైన ఆహారధాన్యాల సరకుకూడా పెరిగిపోతాయి. ప్రజాసామాన్యానికి దీనివల్ల నష్టమే సంభవిస్తుంది. అనేకమంది డ్రైవర్లు, కండక్టర్లు నిరుద్యోగులైపోతారు. ఎక్కువబస్సులు రూట్లనుంచి తీసివేయవలసివస్తుంది. ఈ కారణములన్నింటిని జ్ఞప్తియందుంచుకొని మంత్రిగారు నా సవరింపు అనగా రూపాయికి 0-1-0 రేటును 0-0-6 కు తగ్గించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను.”

SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—“ Sir, I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Sri P. Venkateswarlu. By the Government amendment it is clear that they realize the necessity for reducing the rate of tax to nine pies. Evidently the incomes of the bus operators are very low owing to the economic depression. Particularly bus operators with less than three buses are really running them simply for the sake of earning livelihood and it is for this reason that I appeal to the Government to take this factor into consideration and reduce the rate to six pies.” 5-30
p.m

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to know from the Hon. Minister the anticipated revenue from taxing public carriers and also taxing stage carriages if the Government amendment is accepted.”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ We expect about Rs. 80.0 lakhs from buses and about Rs. 20 to 30 lakhs from public carriers.”

* **SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—**“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment—

‘ For the words “ one anna ” occurring in the fifth line, substitute the words “ one pie ”.’

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [6th December 1952]

Sir, in effect my amendment seeks to nullify the entire Bill. I do not want to repeat all the arguments that have already been advanced in the earlier stages. But I want to touch upon certain points raised by the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour during the course of his reply. His main argument is that all the bus and lorry operators are paying income-tax and that therefore the very fact that they are paying income-tax, is proof that they will be able to bear this taxation also. Therefore he means that they are making profits. It would have been better if he had placed before this House what exactly is the amount of income-tax that has been paid by these operators and what are the net profits they are actually getting today after paying income-tax and how much this additional taxation will cut into their existing net profits. We know that the income-tax is about 2½ annas in the rupee. The point is that the amount of taxation that is proposed is about 45 per cent of the total taxes that are paid by the operators at present, the total taxes including income-tax, petrol tax and other taxes. Therefore the incidence of proposed taxation will be far greater than the income-tax itself. Now, is the Hon. Minister in a position to tell us that the proposed taxation will not be greater than the income-tax itself and that the operators will be in a position to continue to bear the burden of taxation and whether all these will not cut into the net profits and finally make the transport pass into the hands of the monopolists? If such a thing takes place, as I am sure such a thing is going to take place, how can it be guaranteed that these operators will not go out of existence and when they go out of existence how can it be guaranteed that the transport will not go into the hands of the monopolists. Instead, the Hon. Minister was saying that the operators were making profits. I am afraid it will be only helping the monopolists to get hold of the transport.

"Secondly, I want to make it absolutely clear that we are opposed to any further taxation by the Government, because we have not got the confidence, from the way in which this Government has been going on, that all the revenues are being properly utilized for the benefit of the people. As some hon. Members have pointed out, there are a number of wasteful items of expenditure, particularly in the portfolio in the hands of the Hon. the Chief Minister, viz., the Police Department. Therefore, instead of reducing the expenditure on this repressive department, to burden the people with fresh taxation is not going to help at all. Therefore, Sir, I move my amendment."

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—"Sir, I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Sri P. Ramamurthi."

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—"నేను ఇచ్చిన సవరణ ఇది—

'For the words "one anna" substitute the words "three pies".'

"ఈ సవరణను ప్రీ పిల్లల మరీ పెంక లేళ్ళవర్గముకూడా యిచ్చారు. అయితే ఎవరిని Speaker గారు ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించమన్నారో తెలియడంలేదు.

6th December 1952] [Sri D. Seetharamiah]

వెంకటేశ్వర్లుగారు ప్రతిపాదించివున్నట్లైతే నేను వారిని బలపరుస్తున్నాను. లేదా నేనే ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. బిల్లులో సూచించిన ఆర్ని రేటులను 9 టైసలకు తగ్గించ వలెనని మంత్రిగారి సవరణ తేచ్చారు. అంటే బస్ యజమానులు ఈ నాడు ఆర్నింగు కొంటున్న లాభాలు అంత ఎక్కువ ఏమీకాదని వారు గుర్తించారన్నమాట. ఈ విషయాన్ని వారు బిల్లును ప్రతిపాదిస్తూ తెలియజేసారన్నమాట. అయితే ఒక్క విషయాన్ని వారు దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకోవాలి. ఈ 9 టైసలైనా చిన్న బస్ యజమానులు ఇచ్చు కోలేరు. అందువల్లనే ఈ రేటును చూడు పెసలకు తగ్గించమని మేము కోరుతున్నాము. ఈ హెచ్చు శిస్తు విధించవలసిన ఆమోదం ఎంతమాత్రం లేదనికూడా నేను మునిచేస్తున్నాను. ఇప్పటికే మోటారు రవాణా వ్యాపారం విశేష పన్ను భారానికి లోబడివుంది. ఈ విషయం మంత్రిగారి తెలియపడుతుంటేదికాదు. అధిక ఆదాయమే వసూలు చేయడం ప్రభుత్వంవారి ప్రదేశ్యం. ఆయినట్లయితే ఆమోదించవలసిన విధానం యిది మాత్రం కాదు. మన దేశాన్నించి బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యనాదులు ఏటేటా ఎక్స్ కోట్ల రూపాయలు కొల్లగొట్టుకుపోతున్నారు. అటువంటివాటిని స్వాధీనంచేసుకోక దేశంలోవుండే చిన్న వ్యాపారస్తులనూడా వ్యాపార రంగంలోంచి తొలగించి వేస్తాం, ప్రయాణీకులమీద ప్రజాసామాన్యం మీద హెచ్చుపన్ను భారాన్ని విధిస్తాం అని చెప్పడం ఎంతమాత్రం సబబుకాదని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించవలసివుంది. ఈ నాడు మోటారు రవాణా వ్యాపారం వెనుకటివలె లాభదాయకంగా లేదు. యుద్ధానికి పూర్వం ఏ చూడు నాలుగు వేలకో లభించే బస్సు ఈనాడు 25 వేలవరకు అమ్ముడు పోతోంది. అంతేకాకుండా టైర్ల, విడి భాగాల ధరలు విపరీతంగా పెరిగిపోయినాయి. పన్నుకూడా గత 5 సంవత్సరాలలో విపరీతంగా పెంచినవేయబడింది. 1949 లో నీటు 1 కి 17 రూపాయలు పన్నుంటే ఈనాడు అది 30 రూపాయలవరకువుంది. వీటి ఆస్పటితోడు ఈ ఆదనపు పన్నును కూడా విధిస్తాము అంటే బస్ వ్యాపారం కొనసాగాలనా లేక ఆపుచేయబడాలనా ప్రభుత్వం ఉద్దేశ్యం. చిన్న వ్యాపారస్తులను రంగంనుంచి తరిమి వేయటానికి గుత్త వ్యాపారులయొక్క చేతులలోనికి బస్ వ్యాపారాన్ని పూర్తిగా స్వాధీనంచేయటానికి మాత్రమే ఈ ఆదనపు పన్ను సహాయపడుతుందని మునిచేస్తున్నాను అందువల్ల మేము సూచించినట్లుగా పన్ను రేటును 0.0-3 కు తగ్గించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" I second the amendment, Sir."

* SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY :—" అధ్యక్షా ! నేను ఈ సవరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. ఈనాడు అధిక మోంద్యం వల్ల బస్ యజమానులకు లాభాలు రావటం లేదు. అనేకమంది చిన్న ఆపరేటర్లకు నష్టమే సంభవిస్తోంది. ఇదివరలో గుంటూరు ఒంగోలు మధ్య తిరిగే బస్సులు రోజుకు ఒక్కొక్కటి 150 రూపాయలవరకు ఆర్జించేవి. కాని ఈ నాడు 70, 80 రూపాయలుకూడా రావడం కష్టమై పోతోంది. అనేక సందర్భాలలో ఖర్చులుకూడా గిట్టుబాటు కావటంలేదని ఆపరేటర్లు చెబుతున్నారు. ఇది ఒకటి రెండు బస్సులు పెట్టుకొని కాలక్షేపం చేసేవారిమాటకాదు. పది బస్సులవరకూవున్న ఆపరేటర్లు నైతం నష్టపోతున్నారు అంటే బస్ రవాణా వ్యాపారం ఎంతనష్టదాయకంగా ఉంటున్నదో ప్రభుత్వం వారు గుర్తించాలి. అనేక సందర్భాలలో బస్సులలో పనిచేసే కార్మికులకు యజమానులు యూనిఫారంలు యివ్వలేమని చెబుతున్నారు. యూనిఫారంలు లేని కారణం చేత ఆఫీసర్లు డ్రైవర్లను, కండక్టర్లను సస్పెండ్ చేసిన సందర్భాలుకూడా ఎక్కువగా ఉన్నాయి. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో బస్సులపై ఆదనంగా ఈ పన్నును

[Sri M. Narayanaswami]

[6th December 1952]

విధించినట్లుంటే అనేకమంది బస్ ఛార్జీకులు నిరుద్యోగులై పోవలసివస్తుంది. ఈవిషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించవలసిన మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ ఆదనపు పన్ను ఎంతమాత్రం విధించరాదు అన్న ఉద్దేశ్యంతోనే ఈ పన్నును ఒక అణానుంచి ఒక దమ్మిడికి తగ్గించవలసిన నేను సవరణ ప్రతిపాదించాను. ఈ పన్నే గనక విధించినట్లయితే చిన్న ఆపరేటర్లు ఎంతోకాలం బస్సులు నడుప లేరు. నానాటికి వారు బస్సులను అమ్ముకొని జీవకోపాధి ఆర్జించుకోలేని స్థితికి రావలసి వస్తుంది. నిరుద్యోగం పొచ్చి పోతుంది. పరిస్థితులు ఈ విధంగా క్లిష్టం కాకముందే ప్రభుత్వంవారు తగినంత శ్రద్ధ తీసుకొని ఈ ఆదనపు పన్నును విధించటం మానుకొనవలసిన మనవి చేస్తున్నాను."

SRI N. SIVARAMI REDDI :—"అధ్యక్షా, నేను ఈ సవరణను బల పరుస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించకపోయినట్లయితే రాయలసీమ లోని బస్ వ్యాపార స్థలకు, ప్రయాణీకులకు ఎంతో నష్టం వాటిల్లుతుందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. కరువు ఛార్జీకాలంలో ఆలమటిస్తున్న రాయలసీమ జిల్లాలలోని ప్రజా సామాన్యం ఈ ఆదనపు పన్ను వల్ల బస్సు రేట్లు హెచ్చు చేయబడినట్లయితే చెల్లించు కోలేరని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. మా జిల్లాలలోని ప్రజలకు కొనుగోలు శక్తి పూర్తిగా పడిపోయింది. ఈనాడు కొద్ది మాత్రపు బస్ చార్జీ యిచ్చుకోలేని పరిస్థితిలో వారున్నారు. శరీరంబో శక్తి లేకపోయినా ఎన్నో మైళ్లు కాలినడకలనే పోతున్నారు. అందువల్ల సర్వసాధారణంగా బస్సులు ఖాళీగానే, ఏ కొద్దిమంది ప్రయాణీకులతో మాత్రమే ప్రయాణం చేయవలసి వస్తోంది. ఇది చాలా విపరీతమైన పరిస్థితి. దీనికి తోడు యింకా ఆదనపు పన్ను వేసినట్లయితే యిప్పుడున్న బస్సులకూడా మూలపడి, ఉన్న కొద్దిపాటి సౌకర్యంకూడా లేకుండా పోతుంది. ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఈ పరిస్థితిని గుర్తించాలి. ఇప్పటికే బస్ యజమానులు విపరీతంగా రేట్లు వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. రు 0-0-7 లకు ఎక్కడ తక్కువలేదు ఇంకా రేట్లు హెచ్చుచేయకూడదంటే వారు బస్సు రూట్లను వదులుకోవలసిన స్థితి ఏర్పడుతుందిగాని వేరే ఊరి లాభం కలు గదు. ఈ ఆదనపు పన్ను వేసినట్లయితే బస్ ఆపరేటర్లు ప్రయాణీకుల వద్దనుంచి ఆదనపు ఛార్జీలు వసూలు చేయవలసి వస్తుంది. మా జిల్లాలలో overload వల్ల సంపాదించామంటే వీలుపడదు. అసలే తగినంతమంది ప్రయాణీకులులేక బస్సులు ఖాళీగా తిరగవలసి వస్తోంది. బస్సులు ఎక్కో కొద్ది మంది ప్రయాణీకులవద్దనుంచే ఈ ఆదనపు రేట్లను వసూలు చేయవలసివస్తుంది. ఇందుకుగాను అనేకమైన అక్రమాలకు బస్ యజమానులు ఒడిగట్టాలి. లేదా వచ్చే ఫలి తం ఏమిటి. బస్ రేట్లు విపరీతంగా పెరిగిపోవడం ప్రయాణీకుల సంఖ్య యింకా తగ్గిపోవడం. అందువల్ల అనేక చిన్నచిన్న బస్ ఆపరేటర్లు రంగంనుంచి తొలగిపోవడం సంభవిస్తుంది. మా జిల్లాలలో ఉన్న ఒక రూటు దూరం ఏడు మైళ్లు ఉన్నప్పటికీ బస్ ఛార్జీ 6 అణాలు వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. ఇకమీదట ఈ రేట్లను పెంచవలసివస్తుంది. ఈ విధంగా అయినట్లయితే మైలుకు ఒక అణా చొప్పున ప్రయాణీకులు చెల్లించుకోవలసి వస్తుంది. ఇది సాధ్యమా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఇప్పటికే మైలుకు 7 పైసలవరకు చెల్లించుకొంటున్న ప్రయాణీకులపై యిది విశేష భారాన్ని తెచ్చి పెడుతుంది అని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

"ఇంకొక విషయం మనవి చేస్తాను. రోజువారీ మైలేజీ 50 మైళ్లకు తక్కువగా ఉన్నట్లయితే ఈ బిల్లు ఆదనపు రేట్లు అట్టి బస్సులకుగాని లారీలకుగాని వర్తించదని ఈ బిల్లు జయొక్క ప్రావైసోలో ఉన్నది. ఈ మినహాయింపువల్ల రాయలసీమలోని బస్ యజమానులకుగాని, ప్రయాణీకులకుగాని ఎంతమాత్రం లాభించ

6th December 1952] [Sri N. Sivarami Reddi]

దని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. మా జిల్లాలు చాలా విస్తీర్ణమైనటువంటివి. సాధారణంగా ఒక పట్టణానికి మరొక పట్టణానికి మధ్యగల దూరం చాలా పెద్దగా ఉంటుంది. అందు వల్ల ఏ బస్ అయినప్పటికీ రోజుకు 50 మైళ్ళకన్న ఎక్కువ ప్రయాణం చేయ వలసి ఉంది. ఈ కారణంచేత ఈ మిశ్రమయింపు మా ప్రజలకు ఎంతమాత్రం లాభా దాయకం కాదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. కాబట్టి ఈ క్లాజును సవరించవలసిన కోరు చున్నాను. ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణలను బలపరుస్తున్నాను."

*SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—“ ఆధ్యక్ష, నేను రామమూర్తిగారు క్రితిపా దించిన సవరణను బలపరుస్తూ మంత్రిగారి సవరణను ప్రతిఘటిస్తున్నాను. ఇందుకు కారణమేమనగా ప్రస్తుత పరిస్థితులలో ప్రజలయొక్క కొనుగోలుశక్తి నానాటికి క్షీణించిపోతున్నది. ఇదే ఒక ప్రధానమైన factor. దీని మూలంగా ఇప్పుడు వ్యాపారములోను, పరిశ్రమలలోను, ప్రతి విషయములోను కూడా మాంద్యము ఏర్పడి యున్నది. ఎక్కడ చూచిన నిరర్థకము ఎక్కువై ప్రజల కొనుగోలుశక్తి పడి పోయినది. కనుకనే ప్రభుత్వ రెక్కలు బట్టి sales-tax గత సంవత్సరము వచ్చి నంత ఈ సంవత్సరము రాలేదని ఆర్థిక మంత్రి నెలవిస్తున్నారు. అటువంటి పరిస్థితు లలో బస్సు యజమానులవైన వన్ను వేయుట చాలా విచారకరము. ఎందుకనగా ఈ భారాన్ని యజమానుల వేసిన వేసినట్లయిన, వారు దాన్ని సహజంగా ప్రయాణికులవైన రుద్దెదరు. ఇప్పుడు ఎక్కడ చూచినా ఆర్థిక మాంద్యము ఏర్పడి private cars కొనే వాళ్ళు కూడా చాలా తక్కువైనారు. నాకు తెలిసినంతవరకు 2 సంవత్సరముల క్రిందట కంటే ఇప్పుడు cars లో ప్రయాణము చేసేంతవారు చాలా తక్కువ ఉంటు న్నారు. రైల్వేలో ప్రయాణికులు కూడా చాలా తగ్గిపోతున్నారు. ఉదాహరణకు నేను ఇదివరకు రైలులో మద్రాసుకు వచ్చేటప్పుడు ప్రయాణికులు ఎక్కువ దట్టంగా ఉండేవారు. కాని ఇప్పుడు అంతమంది ప్రయాణము చేయమంటుంటేదు. దీనికి కారణ మేమిటంటే, ప్రజల కొనుగోలు శక్తి తగ్గిపోయింది. అప్పుడు వారి ఆవసరాలనుకూడ తగ్గించు కొంటున్నారు. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో ప్రభుత్వము ప్రజలమీద ఇంకా ఆదనపు పన్నులను రుద్దడానికి ప్రయత్నించమంటుంటే చాలా శోచనీయము కనుక ప్రభుత్వము ప్రస్తుత విధానాన్ని ఉపసంహరించుకోవాలని నేను కోరుచున్నాను.

5-50 p.m.

“ రెండవది, ఇప్పుడు చాలాచోట్ల కరువు ఏర్పడి, చాలమంది ప్రజలకు పనులు లేకున్నందున గంజికూడ లేకుండా, ఇతరచోట్లకు వలస వెళ్ళుతున్నారు. అనేక కార్లు, లారీలు, వాటినికొనేవాళ్ళు లేనందున, మూలపడిపోతున్నవి. మా పల్నాడు తాలుకాలో అనేకమంది లారీ యజమానులు దివాలాతీసిన కారణంగా చాలలారీలు మూలపడిపోయి నవి. వాటిని కొనేవాళ్ళకూడా లేనందువలన వాటి ధరలకూడ పడిపోయినవి. ఈ రీతిగా అవధిపడుచున్న ప్రజలమీద పన్నులు రుద్దడమే ప్రభుత్వానికి సరిపాటి ఆయిపోయి నది. ఇటువంటి పద్ధతిలో దీన్ని Welfare State అని, ప్రభుత్వ చెప్పకొంటున్నారంటే చాలా అవ్యర్థంగాఉంది. ఎవరి welfare కోసరము ప్రభుత్వము ఈ పద్ధతులు అవలంబిస్తున్నారో బోధపడడంలేదు. కనుక ప్రభుత్వానికి నేను మనవిచేయనదేమనగా, కనీసము కరువు ప్రాంతాలవై దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని, అక్కడ ప్రజలకు ఈలాటి పన్నులు విధివేయకుండా చూడవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను. ఒకవైపు రాయల్సీమంతో కూడాను, మరొకవైపు నెల్లూరు, గుంటూరు జిల్లాలలోని మెట్టతాలుకాలలోను, కరువుపల్ల ప్రజలు వాధపడుతున్నారు. వీరు ఒకప్రక్కన వివరీత కరువుకుగురియై వాధపడు తుంటే, ఇంకొక ప్రక్కన వారివైన పన్నులుగూడా రుద్దడమంటే ఎంతఘోరంగా

[Sri K. Subba Reddi]

[6th December 1952]

ఉంటుందో గుర్తించవలసియున్నది. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో ప్రభుత్వము ప్రజలయొక్క కొనుగోలు శక్తి అధివృద్ధిపరచే చార్జ్ కమాలను తలపెట్టుట దాని కర్తవ్యముగాని, ఈ మాదిరి అదనపు పన్నులు వేయకూడదు. ప్రభుత్వము ఇప్పుడు తలపెట్టిన అదనపు పన్ను విరమించుకోవలసిందని కోరుచున్నాను.”

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, I think I have already stated that this is a measure for getting some income for the Government. So if you are going to bring the rate down to the level of one pie or even three pies, the purpose of having argued the whole matter for the past one and a half days will not be achieved. Even if it is brought down to six pies, we will not be getting sufficient income. I therefore oppose the amendments.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will put the amendment of Mr. Ramamurthi, then the amendment of Mr. Seetharamiah and then the amendment of Mr. Venkateswarlu to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘For the words “one anna” occurring in the fifth line, substitute the words “one pie.”’

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘For the words “one anna”, substitute the words “three pies.”’

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘In line 5, for the words, “one anna in the rupee”, substitute the words “six pies in the rupee.”’

The amendment was declared lost.

Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu demanded a poll.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I wish to know from the Leader of the Opposition whether this amendment is being pressed to a division.”

6 p.m. SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ The member presses for a division, Sir.”

A poll was taken and the House divided thus—

Ayes.

Sri G. Latchanna.
“ M. Muni Reddi.
“ B. Gangayya Naidu.
“ K. V. Ramesam.
“ K. Narayana.
“ M. Srungaram.
“ M. Gangappa.
“ M. Pentannaidu.
Dr. K. B. Menon.
Sri M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
“ S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.

Sri K. R. Nallasivam.
Janab K. Moidoo.
Sri K. Venkatakurmi Naidu.
“ C. Velukkan.
“ K. P. Gopalan.
“ S. Vadivelu.
“ V. Madanagopal.
“ N. Sivaram.
“ P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
“ P. Narasimha Reddi.
“ N. Sivarami Reddi.

6th December 1952]

Ayes—cont.

Sri D. Seetharamiah.
" C. H. Kanaran.
" K. Madhavan Nambiar.
" R. Krishnan.
" E. T. Kunhan.
" M. Hanumantha Rao.
" K. Rajagopala Rao.
" P. Venkatasiviah.
" P. Rama Rao.
" V. Rama Rao.
" P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
" K. Malakondayya.
" M. Narayanaswamy.
" K. Venkaiah.
" P. Syamasundara Rao.
" B. Lakshminarasa Raju.
" G. Anjaneyalu.
" V. Sri Krishna.
" G. Joseph.
" D. Lakshmayya.
" G. Nageshwara Rao.
" Alluri Venkataramaraju.
" R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
" K. Ranga Rao.
" K. Subba Reddi.
" Chandra Ramalingayya.
" G. Rama Rao.
" M. Veerabhadram.
" V. V. Ramasami.
" M. Palaniandi.

Sri A. Veloo.
" Mottayya Kudumbar.
" Lakshmi Narayana Reddi.
" M. Manicka Sundaram.
" S. Kasi Reddy.
" Saka Venkata Rao.
" T. Nagi Reddi.
" Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.
" Bojja Appalasamy.
" S. Vemiah.
" R. Siddanna Gowd.
" M. Lakshmanaswamy.
" Y. V. Krishna Rao.
" C. Subbarayudu.
" D. Basivi Reddi.
" K. Bapanna Dora.
" N. K. Palaniswamy.
" C. Pulla Reddi.
" G. Bapanayya.
" T. Viswanatham.
" P. Ramamurthi.
" T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
" K. R. Viswanathan.
" A. Govindasamy Nayakar.
" K. C. Gopalan Unni.
" M. Venugopal Gounder.
" K. T. Sridharan.
" M. Narayana Kurup.
" M. Narayana Nambiar.
" P. K. Gopalakrishnan.

Noes.

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
" A. B. Shetty.
" M. A. Manickavelu
Naicker.
" Dr. U. Krishna Rao.

Sri K. Rajaram.
" C. Rajam Ramaswami.
" P. G. Karuthiruman.
" B. K. Nallasamy.
" S. C. Virupakshayya.
" P. S. Nalla Gounder.
" P. G. Manickam.
" N. Mahalingam.
" R. Kuppuswami.
" V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.
" P. S. Rangaswamy Naidu.
" S. R. Arumugam.
" K. H. Bomman.
" Kempai Gounder.
" T. M. Kaliannan.
" M. P. Periaswami.
" A. Sambasivam.
" Lakshmana Kandar.

Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu.

The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan
Nayar.

" Dr. R. Nagan Gouda.

Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
" T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.
" K. Koti Reddi.
" M. R. Ramachandran.
" O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
" B. Parameswaran.
Janab S. Khadir Sheriff.

Sri A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
" R. Thangavelu.
" R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.
" M. Kandasamy Padayachi.
" V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
" G. Vaghoesam Pillay.
" A. S. Sahajanandam.
" O. A. Nanjappa.
" A. M. Ratnaswami.
" M. Marimuthu.

The Hon. Sri V. C. Palaniswami Goun-
der.

" K. Venkataswamy Naidu.
" N. Sankara Reddi.
" D. Sankaravayya.
" S. B. P. Pattabhirama
Rao.

Sri M. S. Muniswamy Pillay.
" C. Chinnaswami Naidu.
" V. S. Sivaprakasam.
" A. Ayyanar.
" V. Muthu.
" A. S. Subbaraj.
" Thinakaranaswami Thevar.
" R. Krishnasami Naidu.
" S. Jayaram Reddiar.
" V. Arumugham.
" R. S. Arumugham.
" Vaikuntam
" G. Govindan
" P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar.
" S. Ramasamy Naidu.
" Ar. A. Rm. Chokkalingam Chettiar.

[6th December 1952]

Noes—cont.

6-10 p.m.	Sri P. Chellathurai.	Sri T. C. Atechannaidu.
	„ R. M. Palaniappan.	„ P. Venkatasubbayya.
	„ T. K. Rama.	„ K. V. Vema Reddi.
	„ T. V. Sannasi.	„ S. Narayanappa.
	„ T. R. Varadan.	„ K. Santhappa.
	„ C. Muthiah Pillay.	„ N. Gopala Menon.
	„ S. Venkatarama Ayyar.	„ B. Krishnamurthy Rao.
	„ S. Chellapandian.	„ K. Varadachari.
	„ K. T. Kosalram.	„ A. Balarama Reddi.
	„ P. Urkavalan.	„ D. Ramabrahmam.
	„ R. S. K. Pandian.	„ K. Adikesavalu Naidu.
	„ M. G. Shanker.	„ H. Ramalinga Reddi.
	„ S. Somayajulu.	„ G. Nagabhushanam.
	„ P. Selvaraj.	„ Ijari Sirasappa.
	„ A. Rami Reddi.	„ S. Parameswarappa.
	„ N. Chenchurama Naidu.	„ T. Anantha Pai.
	„ P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.	„ Y. Manjappa Shetty.
	„ K. Shanmugham.	„ K. Venkatramana Gowda.
	„ G. Narayanasamy Naidu.	„ K. Ishwar.
	„ D. Narayana Raju.	„ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
	„ Raja Sri V. V. Krishnam Raju	Janab M. S. Mogral.
	Bahadur.	Sri T. Chinnayya.
	„ Thota Ramasamy.	„ W. J. Fernandez.
	„ P. Satyanarayana Reddi.	„ M. Subramania Nayakar.
	„ Raja M. A. Muthiah Chettiar.	Janab K. Uppi.
	„ V. C. Chudamani Deo.	„ Kunhi Mohamed Shaffee.
	„ P. Gunnaaya.	„ K. M. Seethi.
	„ L. Lakshmana Das.	Sri V. Balakrishnan.
	„ H. Satyanarayana Dora.	„ Pragada Kotaiah.
	„ M. Rajeswara Rao.	

Ayes 81; Noes 121.

The amendment was lost.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, one of the weightiest Members of this Assembly (Sri K. Varadachari) was seen dozing when the Chair called for the ‘ Noes ’. He did not hear it. When the Member beside him patted him on his back, he was startled, and he stood up. I want to know whether his standing up can be taken into account as a vote.” (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member could have raised a point of order at that time.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I did not raise a point of order because his vote would not have affected the result of the poll.”

SRI K. VARADACHARI :—“ I was quite awake at the time, but I was talking to a Friend when the Chair called for the ‘ Noes ’.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member be alert hereafter. I will put the Government amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ In the opening paragraph of this clause for the words “ at the rate of one anna in the rupee on the fares and freights payable to the operators of such stage carriage and public carrier vehicles ”, substitute the following :—

“ at the rate of nine pies in the rupee on the fares and freights payable to the operators of such stage carriages and at

6th December 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

the rate of six pies in the rupee on the freights payable to the operators of such public carrier vehicles.” ” ”

The amendment was carried.

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ ఆధ్యక్షా, మూడవ క్లాజులోని, 4, 5 lines లో ఉన్నటువంటి ఈ క్రింది పదాలను తీసివేయాలనే సవరణ ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను :—

‘ In lines 4 and 5 omit the words “ and on all goods transported by public carrier vehicles.” ’

“ లారీలమీద శిస్తు వేయరాదు అనే ఈ సవరణయొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశము. లారీల పరిస్థితి ఈ నాడు చాలా అభ్యాన్నముగానున్నది. మన వడ్డరాసు కోస్తాలో, 1952 వ సంవత్సరము మే నెల నాటికి 1,934 లారీలు ఉన్నవి. వీటికిచాలా లారీలు single ownership క్రింద ఉన్నవి. అటువంటివన్నీ వీటిపైన ఆదనపు శిస్తు వేయడమంటే, ఈ లారీ transport ను రద్దుచేయడమే అవుతుంది. ఈ లారీ రవాణా సౌకర్యము నిలచిపోయిందంటే, వస్తువులను రవాణా చేయడంలో ప్రజలు చాలా ఇబ్బందులు పడవలసిఉంటుంది. రైల్వేలో రవాణా చాలా ఆలస్యంగా జరుగుతూ ఉంటుంది, ధాన్యము, తదితర వస్తువులు రైల్వే ద్వారా చాలా ఆలస్యంగా రవాణా అవుతూ ఉంటుందని, అందరికీ తెలుసు. చాలామార్లు waggons లేకుండా చాలా ఇబ్బంది పడవలసియుంటుంది రవాణా చేసినప్పటికీకూడ, ఈ goods మధ్యన ఎక్కడంటే అక్కడ నిలిచిపోతూ ఉంటాయి. కనుక ఇటువంటి కష్టస్థితిలో, రవాణా సౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేసేందుకు లారీలయొక్క అవశ్యకత గుర్తించవలసియుంటుంది. తరువాత, రైల్వే లేవటువంటి ప్రదేశాలు ఎక్కడ ఉన్నాయి. రాయలసీమలో చూచినట్లయితే, చాలా చోట్లకు రైల్వే మార్గాలే లేవు. అటువంటి రైల్వే సౌకర్యములేని రాయలసీమ, తదితర ప్రదేశాలలో లారీలద్వారా మూలమూలమును సరుకుల రవాణా లారీలవల్లనే జరుగుచున్నది. ఇక్కడ వడ్డరాసునుండిగాని లేక బళ్లారినుంచిగాని, మారముగానున్న వి విజయవాడకో లేక గుంటూరుకో 1, 2 రోజులలో లారీలవల్ల సరుకులు రవాణా చేయవచ్చును. అదేచోట్లకు రైల్వే ద్వారా రవాణా కావలసినట్లే, ఎక్కడినక్కడ వస్తును, మరియు ఎన్నో ఇబ్బందులు పడవలసిఉంటుంది. ఇంత ముఖ్యపాత్రను వహిస్తున్నటువంటి లారీలపైన వాటిసరకుల పైన పన్ను వేయడమంటే, వీటిని transport వనిని విరమించుకోమని చెప్పడమే అవుతుంది. కనుక ఈ లారీలపైన ఆదనపుపన్ను వేయకూడదని కోరుచున్నాను. అంతేకాకుండా, ఈ బస్సులయొక్కయు, లారీలయొక్కయు ధరలు నానాటికి పెరిగిపోతున్నవి. వీటికి spare parts యొక్కయు petrol యొక్కయు ధరలుగూడ పెరుగుచున్నవి. ఇంత ఎక్కువ ధరలు పెట్టి వీటిని కొనడమే కాకుండా మరల ఈ ఆదనపు పన్నులుకూడ అచ్చుకోవలయునంటే చాలా కష్టంగా ఉంటుంది. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో లారీల పై ఈ పన్ను వేయకూడదు. ఇంకోవిషయం మోటారు కార్మికుల పట్ల ప్రభుత్వము విమోచన శ్రద్ధతోనుకొని వారికి సహాయము చేస్తున్నదా అని చూస్తాం. ఈనాడు, మోటారు కంపెనీలలోను, fleets లోను ఉన్నటువంటి కార్మికులు, డ్రైవర్లు, క్లీనర్లు మొదలగువనివారు, చాలా అవస్థలనుపడుచున్నారు. వారికి బతాయిగాని, జీతాలుగాని యజమానులు సరిగా ఇవ్వడంలేదు, వారినుండి యజమానులు ఎక్కువవనిని రాబడుచున్నారేగాని వారికి బతాయి జీతాలు చాలాపీసంగా ఇస్తున్నారు. ఈ మోటార్ workers కుమయమై 1948 సంవత్సరంలో,

[Sri D. Seetharamiah]

[6th December 1952]

Industrial Tribunal వారు ఒక తీర్పు ఇచ్చారు. ఆ తీర్పును ప్రభుత్వము ఆమలు పెట్టడం జరిగిందా అంటే అదిలేదు. బస్సుయజమాన్సుగాని లారీయజమాన్సుగాని ఈ తీర్పును అంగీకరించి దీనిని ఆమలుకు తీసుకొనిరాలేదు. ఈ రీతిగా హీనస్థితిలో ఉన్నటువంటి మోటారు కార్మికుల పరిస్థితిని అభివృద్ధిపరచడానికి ప్రభుత్వము ఎందుకు మొట్టమొదట ప్రయత్నించమహదాని అడుగుచున్నాను. 10,943 లారీలలో పనిచేస్తున్నటువంటి సుమారు 20 వేలమంది డ్రైవర్లు, కండక్టర్లు, క్లీనర్లు యీ కోస్టాలో అవస్థపడుచున్నారు. వీరేగాక యీ కోస్టాలోని 6,804 బస్సులలో పనిచేయు డ్రైవర్లు, కండక్టర్లు కష్టపడుతున్నారు. వారికి జీతాలు బతాల్ హెచ్చుచేసి వారికి సహాయంచేసేందుకు ప్రభుత్వము ముందుకు రాకుండా బస్సు యజమానులవద్దనుండి, లారీయజమానులవద్దనుండి వారికి వసూలు లాభాన్ని అంతా రాబట్టుకొనేందుకు ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నది. ఎప్పుడైతే ప్రభుత్వము ఈ యజమానులవద్దనుండి అదనపు పన్నులు వసూలు చేస్తుంటే, అప్పుడు ఈ యజమానులు rationalisation scheme ను తీసుకొనివచ్చి, పనివారిని తగ్గించి 5 గురు డ్రైవర్లు ఉండేవిట ముగ్గురినే ఉంచి, ఇప్పుడు 8 గంటలు పనిచేస్తూయంటే ఇకముందు 10 గంటలనేపు పని చేయించుకొని ఆ విధంగా వారికినష్టము కలుగకుండా, ఆ కష్టనష్టాలన్నీ పనివారిమీద రద్దుతారు.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“As none of the Panel of Chairmen is here I shall ask Mr. Seethi Sabib to occupy the chair for five minutes. I do not think the House has any objection.”

(Janab K. M. Seethi then occupied the chair.)

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ఉపాధ్యక్ష, ఈ లారీలలో పనిచేస్తున్నటువంటి డ్రైవర్లు కండక్టర్లుగారి జీతాలు లేకుండాచాలా ఇబ్బందులు పడుతున్న విషయము ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించవలసియున్నది. ఈ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వము సరియైనటువంటి శ్రద్ధ తీసుకొని యజమానులపైన వత్తిడి తీసుకొనివచ్చి ఆ పనివారికి హెచ్చు జీతాలు ముట్టేటట్లు చేయకుండా యజమానులనుండి శిస్తు మూలకంగా వైకము వసూలు చేయటమహత్రమే ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నదని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ప్రభుత్వానికి వైకము కావలసియుంటే, ఇతర విధంగా రాబట్టవచ్చును. ఇప్పుడు ఎన్నో బస్సులు ఎన్నో లారీలు పరిక్లిం లేకుండా ఉంటున్నవి. ప్రభుత్వము వాటికి పరిక్లిం ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, ఎంతో వైకము వస్తుంది. అదే విధంగా మద్రాసుకోస్టాలో ఇప్పుడు 23 వేల వెలిల్లర కార్లున్నాయి. వీటన్నిటివైనకూడ శిస్తు వేసి వైకము రాబట్టుటకు వీలన్నది. ప్రైవేటు కార్లు కలిగి ఉన్నవారంతా కోటీశ్వరులు పెద్ద ధనవంతులుగా ఉంటున్నారు. కనుక అటువంటి private cars మీద శిస్తు వేయడం సబబుగా ఉంటుంది. ఇప్పుడు మద్రాసు కోస్టాలో దాదాపు 2,800 లారీలు, 2,000 బస్సులు పరిక్లిం లేకుండా ఉంటున్నాయి. వాటికి పరిక్లిం ఇచ్చి ఆ విధంగా వైకము సరిజేసుకొనవచ్చును.

“తరువాత రవాణా సౌకర్యముల గురించి ఆలోచించినట్లయితే, రైళ్లగుండా సరకుల రవాణా చాలా కష్టంగాని ఆలస్యంగాను ఉంటున్నదని, ఈ రవాణా ఇబ్బందులు తొలగించేందుకు లారీలు చాలా ఉపయోగపడుతున్నాయని యిదివరలో తెలియజేశాను. ఇప్పుడు ఒకటి రెండు లారీలుగల యజమానుల లాభాలనుగురించి చూస్తాం. ఉదాహరణకు మదనపల్లెనుండి మద్రాసుకు వచ్చేటటువంటి లారీలో 35 బస్తాలకంటే ఎక్కువగా వేసినట్లయితే దాన్ని పోలీసులు ఆటంకపరచి,

6th December 1952] [Sri D. Seetharamiah]

కేసులు పెట్టి జుల్టానా వేస్తారు. అప్పుడు వందలకొలది టైక్స్ అప్పుకోవలసి యుంటుంది. 35 బస్తాలకు టైక్స్ ఒకటి, రెండు బస్తాలు అధికంగా వేసినట్లయితే, దానికోసరము, ప్రతి పోలీసువానికి లంచము ఇవ్వవలసియుంటుంది. ప్రతి పోలీసు వాడు ప్రతి స్టేషనువద్ద లారీలను నిలబెట్టి లంచాలు గుంజుతూఉంటాడు. ఒక్కొక్క పోలీసుకు రూ 1, 2, 3 లు ఈ ప్రకారము లంచం ఇవ్వవలసి ఉంటుంది. దానికి తోడు, జుల్టానా వేస్తే దాన్ని అప్పుకోవలసియుంటుంది. ఇంక, ఆ 35 బస్తాలు రవాణాచేసినందుకు దానినుండి వచ్చే లాభము చూచినట్లయిన, బస్తాకు 2 రూపాయల ప్రకారము, 35 బస్తాలకు 70 రూపాయలు వస్తుంది. ఈ 70 రూపాయలలో, ఇన్ని లంచాలు, టైగా, జుల్టానాపడితే దాన్ని కూడా భరించుకోవలసియుంటుంది. తరువాత, వీటికి tyres మరియు spare parts అప్పుడప్పుడు కొనవలసియుంటుంది. ఒక్కొక్క tyre ధర 400, 500 రూపాయలవరకు ఉంటుంది. ఈ ఖర్చులుగాక అదనముగా యీ బిల్లులో చూపించినట్లు శిస్తు వేస్తే యజమానులు డ్రైవర్లకు మిగతాపనివారికి జీతాలు ఇవ్వకుండా వారికి చాలా ఇబ్బందులు కలుగజేస్తారు. అటువంటిప్పుడు, కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము ఈ లారీలలోను, బస్సులలోను పనిచేయు వారికి మేలు చేయుటకు బదులు నష్టాన్ని కలిగిస్తుంది, కాన, ఈవిధంగా చిన్న యజమానులనుండి టైక్స్ రాబట్టుట సరియైనటువంటి పద్ధతి గాదని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. కనుక నా సవరణను ఆంగీకరించాలని కోరుచున్నాను.”

(At this stage Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.)

* SRI P. RAMA RAO :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈసవరణను నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. ఇదివరకే, అసలు ఈ పన్ను మొత్తంగా వేయడమే సరియైనటువంటిది గాదని చెప్పాము. అరితగా చేయలేదు కనుక ఈ సవరణనైనా ప్రభుత్వము ఆంగీకరించుట కొంత సయంగా ఉంటుంది. ఈనాడు, లారీలవాళ్లందరూకూడా చాలా డబ్బు ఉండి లారీలను కొని నడుపుతున్నటువంటివాళ్లు కాదు. అనేకమంది డ్రైవర్లుగా, ఉండి విడో విధంగా కొంత భుక్తి సంపాదించుకొనవచ్చునని చాలావరకు అప్పుచేసి, లారీలు కొని వాటిని నడుపుతున్నారు. వారికి పేరే ఇతర వృత్తులు దొరకక, ఈ విధంగా చేస్తే వారి జీతమైనా గిట్టుతుందనే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో, ఈ లారీలు సంపాదించుకొనే పనికి పూనుకొన్నారు. అనేకమంది ఈ విధంగా చిన్నచిన్న వారే ఈ రోజున లారీలు కలిగియున్నటువంటివారు. అటువంటివారిపైన ఈ పన్ను వేయడం చాలా అన్యాయంగా ఉంటుంది. అనేక మంది తీసుకొన్నటువంటి లారీలు అప్పులు చేసి తీసుకొన్నటువంటివి. ఆ అప్పులుకూడ పూర్తిగా తీర్చలేక నానా పాదలుపడుతూ ఉంటారు. ఈ కష్టాలవల్ల కొన్ని లారీలు మూల పడడంకూడా జరుగుచున్నది. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో ప్రభుత్వము ఈ goods రవాణామీదకూడా ఈ విధంగా పన్ను వేసినట్లయిన ఇప్పుడు ఉన్న లారీలను నడపడముకూడ కష్టతరమై చాలా మంది దివాలాతీసి ఆ లారీలను మూలపడవేసే పరిస్థితి వస్తుంది. కనుక, 1, 2 లారీలు కలిగియున్నటువంటి చిన్నచిన్న వాళ్లమీద ఈ పన్ను వేయకూడదని నేను ప్రభుత్వానికి తెలియచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ సందర్భంలో, మంత్రిగారు, చాలా మంది లారీ యజమానులు Income-tax కడుతున్నారనియు, చాలా అదాయము వస్తున్నందువల్లనే వారు Income-tax కట్టవలసివస్తున్నాదనియు, కనుక ఈ పన్ను వేయడంవలన దీన్ని వారు కట్టలేనంత పరిస్థితి ఏమి ఏర్పడదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. కాని నిజంగా, విడో కొద్దిమంది మాత్రము Income-tax కట్టునటువంటివాళ్లు ఉండవచ్చునేమో గాని చాలామంది 1, 2 లారీలు కలిగి

[Sri P. Rama Rao]

[6th December 1952]

నటువంటివాళ్లు ఉన్నారు. వీరంతా Income-tax కట్టడంలేదు. 10, 15 లారీలు కలిగినటువంటివారు మాత్రము ఈ Income-tax కట్టుటకు అవకాశ మున్నదిగాని 1, 2 లారీలు కలవారు దీనిని కట్టలేరు. ఇప్పుడు చాలా మంది లారీ యజమానులు చిన్నవాళ్లే అయివున్నారు. వీరిలో చాలామంది డ్రైవర్లుగా ఉండేవారు ఉన్నారు. అటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో, ఈ చిన్నచిన్నవాళ్లమీద ఈ పన్ను వేయడం చాలా అన్యాయంగా ఉంటుంది. కావలసివస్తే, Income-tax కట్టేవాళ్లమీద పన్ను వేసే విషయం అలోచించవచ్చును. కాని చాలామంది లారీలు, బస్సులు నడుపుతున్నవారు చిన్నవాళ్లనని Income-tax కట్టలేనటువంటివారేనని తెలియ జేస్తున్నాను. వీరిలో చాలా మంది వేరే డ్రైవర్లును పెట్టుకోలేక స్వంతంగానే డ్రైవ్ చేసేటువంటివాళ్లు ఉన్నారు. వీరు విదేశీ విధంగా కష్టపడి కో-ఆపరేటివ్ సొసైటీలలో అప్పులు తీసుకొని ఒక రూటు సంపాదించుకొని, ఆ విధంగా అనేక ఇబ్బందులలో పీడిన నడుపుతున్నారు. కనుక ఇటువంటివాళ్లమీద ఈ పన్ను వేయకూడదని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరుతూ, ఈ సవరణను బలపరచున్నాను.”

6-30
p.m.

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అధ్యక్ష, లారీలమీద పన్ను మినహా యించాలని కోరుతూ, నేను యీ సవరణ తెచ్చియ్యాను—

‘(ii) For the words “stage carriages, and on all goods . . . public carrier vehicles” substitute the following:—

“fleets, companies and limited concerns of stage carriages and on all goods transported by fleets, companies and limited concerns of public carrier vehicles at the rate of one quarter anna in the rupee on the fares and freights payable to the operators of such concerns”’.

ఈ సవరణ బలపరచడంలో అనేక కారణాలు ఉన్నవి. ముఖ్యంగా యీ బిల్లు అంతా మొత్తము వ్యతిరేకించుతున్నామనే కారణంచేత కాకుండా యింకా యితర కారణాలను పురస్కరించుకొని నేను యీ సవరణను బలపరచుచున్నాను. క్రిందటి బడ్జెటు సమావేశంలో తెచ్చినటువంటి బిల్లు లో యీ లారీల సమస్యను లేదు. ఇది కొత్తగా యీ బిల్లు లో చేర్చబడింది. మంత్రిగారు సమాధానం చెప్పుతున్నప్పుడు బస్సులమీద పన్నులు వేసేనట్లయితే శ్రయ్యాణీకులమీద వసూలు చేస్తారని చెప్పారు. అయితే లారీలమీద వేస్తే, లారీ యజమానులు యీ పన్ను మొత్తం ప్రజలనుండి వసూలు చేయరా, అది ప్రజలమీద పన్ను విధించినట్లు కాదా అని అడుగుచున్నాను. వస్తువుల ధరలు పెరగడంవల్ల వచ్చే ఆదాయంలోనుంచి పన్నుకు మార్పుటానికి అవకాశం ఉంటుంది. మంత్రిగారు యీ విషయం గమనించవలసి ఉంటుంది. యిదివరకు పోయిన యుద్ధం రోజులలో రైల్వే రాకపోకలు తగ్గటమవల్ల, సరకుల రవాణాకుగాను కొద్ది గొప్ప డబ్బు ఉన్నవాళ్లు ఒకటో, రెండో లారీలు కొనుక్కొని జీవించే అవకాశం ఉండింది. ఆ రోజులలో లారీలు ఎక్కువగా ఉండేవి. అప్పుడు డబ్బు ఎక్కువ ఆదాయం రావడంవల్ల ఎక్కువగా ఖర్చుపెట్టగల శక్తియన్నది. ఈ రోజులలో అన్ని లారీలు లేవు. పున్నవి ఒకటో రెండో పున్నను, ఆదాయం తగ్గిందని అందరకు తెలుసును. రైల్వే రాకపోకలు ఉంటే, లారీలతో పనిలేదు. అప్పుడు spare parts కావలసంటే. ఎంత డబ్బు ఆయినను ఖర్చుపెట్టికొనేవాళ్లు. యీ రోజులలో ఆదాయంలేదు. spare parts కొనటానికి శక్తిలేక లారీలు మూలకెట్టుకొని కూర్చున్నారు. ఈ రోజులలో యీ లారీలవల్ల జీవించేది సామాన్య ప్రజానీ

6th December 1952] [Sri D. Seetharamiah]

కానికి చెందినవారు. యీ కొనుక్కోనే ఒక లారీ అయినా, యింటాల్లోవుంటే సొమ్ము వస్తేరా అక్కుకొని యీ లారీ మీద బ్రతుకుతున్నారు. నిజంగా ఆలోచించితే, వీళ్లు బీద ప్రజానీకానికి చెందినవారే. ఇదియనుగాక యీ ఒకటో రెండో లారీల యజమానులు ఒక్కరేగాకుండా యిందులూ యిద్దరు, ముగ్గురు భాగస్వాములనుకూడా చేర్చుకొని యుంటున్నారు. ఈ లారీ యజమానులు యీనాడు పొల్లుపోసుకుంటున్నారంటే చాలా దుర్భరముగా జీవించుచున్నారని చెప్పవచ్చును. ఈ విషయము లన్నియు ప్రభుత్వం దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొనవలసిన అవసరం ఉన్నది. దేశంలో ఒకటో రెండో లారీలు పెట్టుకొన్నవారిని ప్రత్యేకంగా అడిగితే, నిజం సంగతి ఎట్లు జీవించగలుగుతున్నారో తెలుతుంది. అందువల్ల యీ లారీలను చిన్న చిన్న బస్సు యజమానులను, యీ పన్ను నుండి మినహాయించాలనిన్నీ, ప్రజలమీద యీ పన్ను విధించకుండా చేయగలములకు ప్రభుత్వం వారిని నా సవరణ అంగీకరించమని కోరుచున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“After the acceptance of the Government amendment, these amendment do not fit in.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“శ్రీరామయ్యగారు, యీ సవరణ out of order అయినదని Speaker గారు మీతో చెప్పమంటున్నారు.”

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఇందులో ఒక కారణము నేను చెప్పదలచాను. ఆదేమిటంటే, యీ బిల్లు పూర్తిగా ప్యాసుచేసిన తర్వాతనే ప్రభుత్వం ప్రవేశపెట్టే amendment అంతా గూడా pass అవుతుంది. అసలు బిల్లే ప్యాసుకాకుండా అవుతున్నప్పుడు. ఏ క్లాజు అయితేనేమి. అందువల్ల ప్రతి amendment యిందులో తీసుకుంటే సరిపోతుంది. దీని తర్వాత speaker గారు చెప్పితే నేను నా రెండవ amendment ను move చేస్తాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“When the amendments do not fit in, the hon. Member cannot move them. Let him move his next amendment.”

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ క్లాజులో నేను యీ విధంగా చేర్పించాలని కోరుచున్నాను :—

‘After the words “payable to the operators” insert the following :—

“who hold permits for more than three such stage carriages or three such public carrier vehicles and to those who function on behalf of fleets and limited concerns.”

“ఈ సవరణను నేను ప్రతిపాదించుచున్నాను. విలసంటే, ఇదివరకే యీ లారీల విషయం పూర్తిగా తెలియజేశాము. ఈ చిన్న చిన్న బస్సు ఓసర్లు, లారీ ఓసర్లు జీవనానికే యీ ఆదాయము చాలక కష్టపడుతున్నారు. ఒక ప్రక్కన ధరలు పెరగడంవల్ల యీ లారీ యజమానులు యీ పన్నును కట్టలేకుండా ఉంటారు. అందువల్ల పెద్ద పెద్ద Limited concerns మీద యీ పన్ను వేస్తే వాళ్లకు వచ్చే ఆదాయములో కొద్దిగా పోపు కష్టముగా యున్నను యీ పన్నును కట్టే స్థితిలో ఉంటారు కాని, యీ స్వల్ప ఆదాయము వచ్చేవాళ్లమీద యీ పన్నును విధించినట్లయితే, వాళ్లు యీ పన్ను కట్టలేక లారీలు, బస్సులు అక్కుకోవలసిన పరిస్థితి

[Sri D. Seetharamiah] [6th December 1952]

విర్వదుతుంది. పెద్ద పెద్ద లారీ ఓనర్స్ ఒక్కొక్క సమయములో యీ అధిక వన్నును కట్టలేక లారీలు ఆమ్ముకుంటూఉంటే, యిక యీ చిన్న యజమానుల సంగతి విమిటా ప్రభుత్వం గుర్తించవలసి యుంటుంది. అందువల్ల యీ చిన్న యజమానుల విషయములో వన్నును మినహాయించాలని కోరుతూ నాసవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. అందువల్ల యీ వన్ను ఎవరిమీద విధించాలంటే 'who hold permits for more than three such stage carriages or three such public carrier vehicles and to those who function on behalf of fleets and limited concerns' ఇటువంటి వారిపైన యీ వన్ను విధిస్తే మంచిది. అంతేకాని మూడు, అంతకన్నా తక్కువగా యీ vehicles ఉండే వాళ్లమీద విధించకూడదని నేను యీ తీర్మానాన్ని ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను."

* SRI D. LAKSHMAYYA :—“అధ్యక్ష, శ్రీ శీతారామయ్యగారు ప్రతి పాదించిన సవరణను నేను బలపరచుచున్నాను. దీనికి కారణమేమిటంటే మూడు vehicles అంతకన్నా తక్కువగా కలిగియున్న యజమానులు ఎక్కువగా మధ్యతరగతికి చెందినవారుగా ఉన్నారు. అసగా ప్రభుత్వం Land Revenue Surcharge Bill తెస్తున్నారని ప్రజలలో అందోళన జాస్తోగా యున్నది. దానికిపైన యీ వన్ను గూడా విధించినట్లయిన వారు యింకను నిరుత్సాహ పడటం తప్ప మరేమీలేదు. దేశ ములో ధనవంతులు లారీలు వగైరా పెట్టుకొని ఆదాయము తీస్తున్నారు. మధ్య తరగతివారు వుదరపోవడాకై ఒకటో రెండో, మూడో లారీలు పెట్టుకొని కుటుంబ పోషణకు చాలకుండా కాలము గడుపుతున్నారు. ధనికవర్గమువారు యీ వన్ను ఎవ్విధముగావో తెచ్చి కట్టగలరు. ఇక యీ మధ్యతరగతివారు యీ లారీలు వన్ను కట్టలేక వాటిని ఆమ్ముకోక తప్పదు. యీ విషయం ప్రభుత్వం దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొన గోర్తాను. దేశంలో రోజురోజుకు కష్టపరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడుచున్న వని ప్రభుత్వం అంగీకరించినప్పుడు యీ చిన్న ఓనర్లమీద యీ వన్ను విధించటం తగదని నా అభి ప్రాయం. అందువల్ల పెద్దలారీ ఓనర్లమీదను, Limited concerns మీదను విధించ వచ్చునుగాని, యీ లారీలు మూడు అంతకన్నా తక్కువగా వున్నవారిమీద విధించ గూడదని మంత్రిగారికి విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తూ యీ సవరణను అంగీకరించమని కోరు తున్నాను.”

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are 981 bus operators in the State. If we exclude the owners of three buses and less, nearly 660 of them would go outside the scope of the tax. That means 66 per cent of the expected revenue will automatically go, and then there is no point in proceeding with the Bill. I oppose the amendment entirely.”

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అధ్యక్ష, తర్వాత సెలెక్టు కమిటీలో కూడా తర్జిమానుని పంపిన బిల్లులో ఈ లారీల సంగతిలేదు. ఇప్పుడు కొత్తగా యీ విషయము చేర్చబడింది. అలాంటప్పుడు ఈ లారీల సంగతి కొత్తగా ఎదుకు చేర్చారో ప్రభుత్వం చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఈ ప్రభుత్వం policy చూడగా చిన్న చిన్న లారీ యజమానులయొక్క రకం ఈ వన్ను మూలంగా పిండి వెయ్యాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యం ఈ ప్రభుత్వానికి ఉన్నట్లు కన్పించుచున్నది. అది తప్ప వేరే ఉద్దేశ్యం కనబడుటలేదు. ఈ విషయములో మంత్రిగారు ఇచ్చిన సమాధానము నేను అంగీకరించడం లేదు.”

6th December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ After the words “ payable to the operators ”, insert the following :—

“ who hold permits for more than three such stage carriages or three such public carrier vehicles and to those who function on behalf of fleets and limited concerns.” ’ ’

The amendment was lost.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘ For the existing provisos, substitute the following :—

“ Provided that the levy under this section shall not entitle an operator to enhance the existing fares and freights :

Provided further that the tax under this section shall not be levied on operators whose average daily collections per bus are below Rs. 85 from passenger fares.” ’ ’

The amendment was duly seconded.

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not rise to plead the case of the motor bus magnates. Our opposition to the Bill is based on the fact that net result of this legislation will be to oppress the poor passenger, whatever the special pleading of the Hon. Minister might be. In justifying the introduction of this Bill, the Hon. Minister said that inasmuch as there was a clause to the effect that the maximum fares would be operative, there was no need to fear that this tax would be passed on to the consumer. I beg to differ. A special technique or Rajagopalachari technique is adopted in the framing of this Bill. In analysing this technique, let me refer to the Tanjore Tenancy Bill. In connexion with that Bill, the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachariar told the tenants that inasmuch as security of tenure was provided for five years, inevitably any Government would be compelled to extend that period by another five years or perhaps permanently. On the other hand, he turned round to the mirasdars and said that he was introducing the Bill to avert the calamity of the land passing to the tiller of the soil. In this way he was trying to satisfy each party or rather both parties. The same technique is being adopted in this Bill also. On the one hand he taunts the Communists and the Opposition generally that they are trying to shield the rich bus operator from being taxed and says that they need not apprehended that the tax will be passed on to the passengers. On the other hand he may tell the bus operators : ‘ Why are you afraid of this taxation measure? We are allowing you to charge fares up to the prescribed maximum of 7 pies per mile. If you fear that you may incur any loss because of this tax you can increase the present rate to the maximum and thereby increase your profits. Therefore, this measure contains within it the possibility of the tax being passed on to the consumer. The chief argument that was put forward by the Hon. Minister was that even without this taxation measure it was possible for the operator to raise the fare from 6 pies to 7 pies. In other words, he was saying that the operation of the law of supply and demand

[Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai] [6th December 1952]

prevented such a rise in fare now. The same argument can also be used against the measure through saying that it is the very same law of supply and demand that will make the bus operator raise the fare from 6 pies to 7 pies, the moment this measurement comes into force. When this Bill becomes law, those marginal operators who are incapable of operating at the rate of 6 pies per mile will be compelled to increase the fare to 7 pies per mile. Therefore, the inevitable consequence of the introduction of this measure will be that fares will go up to the maximum leviable under the present law. No doubt, Sir, this particular measure has a peculiar feature, namely, that it is in the nature of a tax on income. Unlike the income-tax, which is levied on the income, after making allowances for certain items of expenditure, this Bill makes the levy as one of the items of general expenditure on the gross-income. To that extent the amount of money that will be assessed for purposes of income-tax is reduced. Thus taking this tax and the reduction in the payable income-tax the total paid by way of taxes may not be as high as is made out. If we take both the taxes, income-tax payable to the Central Government and the levy payable to the Government of Madras, the total amount may not come to as much as Rs. 80 lakhs. Nevertheless, as stated by the Hon. Minister this afternoon, this tax is going to be levied on even small operators owning 1, 2, or 3 buses. These people who are just on the margin will certainly raise the passenger fare to the maximum leviable under the Act. For the reasons I have stated, I support the amendment."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“అధ్యక్ష, నా వేరున ఉన్న సవరణలను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను :—

‘Add the following at the end :—

“or the fare charged by the operator on the 1st of April 1952 where such fare is less than the maximum fare prescribed by the Government.”

(or in the alternative)

In the First proviso, add at the end, the following :—

“or the existing rates, whichever is advantageous to the passengers.”

“ఈ amendment చాలా ముఖ్యమైనదని ఆసక్తికలిగి ఉన్నాను. ఎందుకంటే. యిప్పటికి గనుక యీ కొత్త పన్ను వేయడం ద్వారా charges కనుక ఎక్కువ చేస్తే ‘or the existing rates whichever is advantageous to the passengers’ అనేది కూడా first proviso చివర add చేయాలని అంటున్నాను. అందువల్ల యీ రెండు amendments ను నేను move చేస్తున్నాను. వీటి ఉద్దేశ్య మేమిటంటే, సర్వసాధారణంగా Bus operators యీ కొత్త పన్ను వేయడం మూలాన పరిసర ప్రాంతాలలో ఉన్న రైల్వే తప్పకుండా పెంచితారని. మన Motor Transport Minister నారు చెప్పబోతున్నదాన్ని బట్టిచూస్తే, యీ ఆపరేటర్లకు ఎక్కువ లాభాలు కట్టిపెట్టాలని కన్పించుచున్నది. ఈ చూడకూడా వారు అంగీకరిస్తున్నారు. వాస్తవము నేను చెప్పితే వారికి గొట్టును. అందువల్ల యిది అవసరం అంటున్నాను. లేకపోతే Bus passenger ల మీద ఎక్కడ అయితే యీ పన్ను వేయటానికి అవకాశం

6th December 1952] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

ఉంటుందో, అక్కడ ఎక్కువ రేటు పెంచుతారుగాన, యిది అనవసరం అని అంటున్నాను. ఇక కొన్నిచోట్ల మైలుకు అయిదు దబ్బిడిలు, ఆరు దబ్బిడిలు రేట్లు వున్నవి. ఈ రేట్లవల్ల ఎక్కువ లాభాలు గణించగలరు. అంట్రాంటప్పడు ప్రజల నుంచి అయిదు దబ్బిడిల నుండి ఆరు దబ్బిడిలవరకు పెంచి, తీసుకోవాలని తేలుతుంది. అయితే యీ విషయంలో Transport Minister గారు యిచ్చిన సమాధానంలో ఒక విషయం ఉన్నదని చెప్పుతున్నాను. అదేమిటంటే అప్పుడుకూడా లాభాలు గణించుటకు అవకాశం ఉన్నప్పుడుకూడా, లాభాలు గణించలేరు. విలసనగా కత్తి దార్లు (competitors) కూడా ఉంటున్నారు. ఇందుకు ఒక విషయం చెప్పుతున్నాను. Competition ఉన్నప్పుడు నష్టానికైనా బస్సులను నడుపుతారు. అప్పుడు operators కు నష్టము వస్తుంది. అప్పుడు transport rates పెంచవలసి వస్తుంది. రేట్లు పెంచితే passengers భరించలేరు. ఈ విషయంగాడా ఆలోచించాలి. ప్రభుత్వం passengers ను బాధపెట్టడం న్యాయంకాదు. అంట్రాంటప్పడు యిది అమలు జరిపి వెంటనే రేట్లు ప్రకటించవలసిన అవసరం వుంది. అందువల్ల మంత్రిగారు దీనిని అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇంకో విషయం చెప్పుతున్నాను. రోజుకు రూ 85 లకు తక్కువ ఆదాయం వస్తే, పన్ను విధించరాదని అంటున్నాను. విలసనగా competition వల్ల బస్సులు కొన్ని సమయములలో నష్టానికి నడవవలసి ఉంటుంది. అంట్రాంటప్పడు యీ Bus operators పన్ను ఎక్కడనుండి కట్టు తారో గమనించాలి. గనుక యీ విషయమునుగూడ అంగీకరించాలని కోరు తున్నాను. ఇందుకుగాను ఒక legislation చేసినప్పుడు మనం ఇది ఆలోచించవలసిన విషయం అన్నమాట. ఇది passengers కు గాని, Bus operators కు గాని అన్యాయం కలిగిస్తున్నదా కాదా ప్రభుత్వం గమనించాలి. ఇంకేకాకుండా మూడు బస్సులు, అంతకు తక్కువగా ఉన్న operators, యీ competition వల్ల సాధారణంగా నష్టమునకైనను ఖర్చులు సరిపెట్టుకొనేందుకు నడుపుతు ఉంటారు. అంట్రాంటప్పడు నూటికి ఆరువంతులు నష్టమే వస్తూ ఉంటుంది. అందుచేత యీ విషయం అంగీకరించాలంటాను. ఈ operators కు యీ పద్ధతి ఉపయోగకరంగా ఉంటుందా లేదా అని ప్రభుత్వం ఆలోచించినట్లుంటే సేను చెప్పేది న్యాయం అని అంటాను. ప్రభుత్వంకు డబ్బు రాకపోతే మరొక మార్గం ఆలోచించాలి కాని, యీ చిన్న Bus operators ను బాధించి లాభమేమి? వార్ల జీవమునకు అడ్డుపోయి, వార్ల చేత చీకరకు యీ Bus లను అమ్ముకొనేందుకు మార్గము విర్రడు తుంది. ఈ కారణములన్నిటిని దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని యీ సవరణలను అంగీకరించా లని కోరుతున్నాను. అయితే యీ చిన్న operators విషయంలో ఏడు దబ్బిడిల వరకుకూడా మినహాయించాలి. అప్పుడే వారికి ఖర్చులు గిట్టుపాటగను. రెండవది యేమిటంటే దినమునకు 85 రూపాయలు తగ్గితే, యీ డబ్బు ప్యాసంజర్లమీద వెయ్య కూడదని అంటున్నాను. నా సవరణలను రెండింటిని ప్రభుత్వం అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I second the amendment. I want the Hon. the Transport Minister to give consideration to the following points which I am raising. They have now fixed it at 9 pies. I believe, from my knowledge, that a third of the operators will immediately go out of the field, and their buses will probably go off the road. It may be that the tax is a regressive tax in the sense that many buses will go off the road. The expected income from this levy may not also be

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[6th December 1952]

realized. Therefore some alternative arrangements must be made. The alternative is this. At least let the Government exempt those who are practically uneconomic operators. Speaking on the amendment exempting owners of three buses and less, the Hon. Minister gave us the figure that out of 981 operators, about 660 operators were owning less than three buses. But then there was a slight miscalculation. These operators did not own 66 per cent of the buses in the State. At best they own only about 1,200 buses out of a total of 7,000 and odd. Therefore, he need not fear that he will lose much if he gives exemptions. In the Select Committee also we did actually suggest that persons whose average daily collection was less than Rs. 85 might be exempted. We quote that figure not because we are interested in that figure, but from the evidence taken and from the replies given by the officers to the questions put by us, it was estimated that the average daily collection was Rs. 85, that is to say, some operators might get more than Rs. 85 and there might be several others who got less. But the average is Rs. 85. Therefore, those who got more than Rs. 85, we thought, would be in a position to pay the tax. As I have said and I repeat again, we are not against taxation as such. We are only thinking about the capacity of the person to pay. Therefore, we suggested in the Select Committee and here again we are moving this amendment in order to reduce the incidence upon a number of persons who will not otherwise be able to pay."

6-50
P.M.

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to support the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri Gopalan. I support it not because I am in favour of the small bus-owner. I do believe that the marginal and sub-marginal man must go. I, therefore, do not accept the argument that if the small man goes, here will be unemployment in the land. But I have other reasons for asking the Government to exempt the small bus-owners from the payment of this tax because I feel that in case the small bus-owners are not protected, if there is a collusion between the officer and the large fleet-owners, then the small bus-owners will be crushed. If the Government can find their way to exempt the small men under the present conditions they are in and under the conditions the industry is organized, it will be a sort of protection for the small bus-owners against exploitation by the large owners. I am pleading for it on this ground and not on the ground that there is any justification for the small bus-owners to exist. The marginal men and sub-marginal men must go because they are not able to render efficient service for the payment that the public makes, and people have a right to demand adequate service for the fare they pay. If the small bus-owners are not able to render efficient service, they ought to go. But there are other reasons, as I said, which induce me to speak on behalf of the small bus-owner. If he is not protected, there will not be rivals to the large fleet-owners and the field will be completely open for them to dominate."

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, நான் இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை ஆதரித்துப் பேசுகின்றேன். ஏனென்றால் பஸ்களில் பிரயாணம் செய்கின்றவர்கள் அனேகமாக ஏழைகள் தான். பஸ்களின்

6th December 1952] [Sri K. R. Viswanathan]

பிரயாணக் கட்டணத்தை அதிகப்படுத்துவதனால், ஏழைகள் தான் மிகவும் பாதிக்கப்படுகிறார்கள். ஏற்கனவே அவர்கள் கொடுக்கின்ற வரிப் பளுவினால் மிகவும் துன்பப்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த நிலையில் இப்பொழுது பஸ் கட்டணத்தில் எவ்வளவு சிறிய தொகை அதிகரிக்கப்பட்டாலும், அது மிகவும் அதிக துன்பத்திற்கு ஏழைகளை உள்ளாக்குமென்று தெரிவித்துக் கொள்ள விரும்புகின்றேன்.

“ உதராணமாகச் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன் : கிராமங்களிலே பஸ்களில் பிரயாணம் செய்கின்ற பிரயாணிகள், அவர்கள் வழக்கமாகக் கொடுக்கும் பஸ் கட்டணத்திற்கு மேல் ஒரு அரையணுவோ அல்லது ஒரு அணுவோ பஸ்காரர்கள் சேர்த்துக்கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லும்போது, அவர்கள் கொடுக்கமுடியாமல், அப்படி சேர்த்துக் கொடுப்பதைவிட நடந்து போவதே நல்லது என்று சில சமயம் நடந்து செல்கிறார்கள். ஒரு பாதையில் நாலேந்து பஸ் முதலாளிகள், நாலேந்து விதமான கட்டணங்களைப் பிரயாணிகளிடமிருந்து வசூல் செய்கின்றார்கள். சர்க்கார் மைலுக்கு 7 பைசா என்று வைத்திருந்தும் கூட, எல்லா பஸ்காரர்களும் அந்த 7 பைசா வீதம் வசூலிப்பதில்லை. அப்படியிருக்கின்றபோது ஒரு பஸ்வரில் அரையணு ஓரணு குறைவாக இருந்தால், அந்த பஸ்களில்தான் அவர்கள் போக விரும்புகின்றார்கள். அவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கை நிலைமை அப்படியிருக்கின்றது. அந்த ஓரணு அரையணு கூட அவர்கள் அதிகமாகக் கொடுக்கமுடியாமல் இருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படி அதிகமாகக் கொடுப்பதற்குப் பதிலாக நான் நடந்தே செல்கிறேன் என்று சொல்லி நடக்க முனைந்துவிடுகிறார். ஆகவே, தங்களுக்கு இருக்கின்ற சிறு சௌகரியத்தைக்கூட விட்டுக்கொடுக்க விரும்புகிறார்கள். அதற்குக் காரணமென்னவென்றால், கிராமங்களிலிருக்கக் கூடிய குடியானவர்கள் அவ்வளவு ஏழ்மையான நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த வரி விதிப்பதனால் அது மிகவும் ஏழைக் குடியானவர்களைத்தான் அதிகமாக பாதிக்கும். ஆகையால், நான் வேண்டுவதெல்லாம், இந்த ஏழைக் குடியானவர்கள், இந்த சிறு சௌகரியத்தைக்கூட அடையமுடியாத வகையில் அவர்களை பாதிக்கின்ற காரணத்தால் இந்த வரியானது அந்த முறையில் விதிக்கப்படக்கூடாது. ஆகையால், அவர்களைப் பாதிக்கக்கூடாது என்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

“ பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்கு வரி போடுவதைப்பற்றி நான் அக்கறை கொள்ளவில்லை. இம்மாதிரி பிரயாணிகளிடமிருந்து வசூலிப்பதை விட்டு விட்டு, அதற்கு மேல் பெரிய முதலாளிகள் இருக்கிறார்களே, அவர்களுக்கு உயர்ந்த விகிதத்தில் வரி போட்டு, பணம் வசூலித்தால், இதிலிருந்து வருவதைக்கொண்டு சரிக்கட்டிக்கொள்ளலாமென்று யோசனையை சர்க்காருக்கு எடுத்துச் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். ஆகவே, இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை ஆதரித்து என்னுடைய பேச்சை இத்துடன் முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, with regard to the amendments that the operators should not be permitted to charge more than what they are charging to-day or what they charged on the 1st of April 1952, I only hope that the rates will not be increased in the interest of good business and in the interest of the bus industry making some money. I hope that the operators will not do anything so bad as this. Any way these are things that have to be watched.

“ With regard to the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Gopalan that Rs. 85 should be fixed as the average daily collection per bus for making the operator liable to pay the tax, I have to say that we agreed to fix instead 50 miles per day as the mileage, as a sort of working arrangement. I oppose the amendments.”

[6th December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' For the existing provisos, *substitute* the following :—

" Provided that the levy under this Section shall not entitle an operator to enhance the existing fares and freights ;

Provided further that the tax under this section shall not be levied on operators whose average daily collections per bus are below Rs. 85 from passenger fares." ' ' ' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following at the end :—

" or the fare charged by the operator on the 1st April 1952 where such fare is less than the maximum fare prescribed by the Government." ' ' ' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In the first proviso, *add* at the end, the following :—

" or the existing rates, whichever is advantageous to the passengers." ' ' ' "

The amendment was lost.

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Before we adjourn, may I suggest that we meet in the morning hereafter? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" We can consider it later. The House will now adjourn and meet again at 2 p.m. on Monday, 8th December 1952."

The House then adjourned.

